The University of Chicago

THE DEVELOPMENT OF PUBLIC SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION IN ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY
OF THE DIVISION OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR
OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
AUGUST, 1946

By
JAMES DESMOND LOGSDON

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
1946

The University of Chicago

THE DEVELOPMENT OF PUBLIC SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION IN ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY
OF THE DIVISION OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR
OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
AUGUST, 1946

By
JAMES DESMOND LOGSDON

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
1946

R. UNIV.
BIBLIOTHEEK
LEIDEN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES. iv

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION. 1

II. THE LEGAL BASIS OF THE ST. LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS . 4

Establishing the Schools
Management of the Schools
Provisions for Financing Education
Extending Educational Opportunities
Recent Constitutional and Legislative Enactments

III. ORGANIZATION OF THE BOARDS 25

Early Organizations
Organization of Board Pursuant to Act of 1833
Activities of Early Boards of Education
Rise of Superintendency
Growth of Superintendent's Influence
Appointment of Examining Committee
Change in Board Membership
Politics within the Board
Organization of Board Pursuant to School Law of 1897
Outside Controls
Interference by City
Assumption of Executive Functions by Board
The Strayer Survey
Action in Selecting Recent Superintendents

IV. DEVELOPMENT OF A PROFESSIONAL STAFF 67

The Assistant Superintendent
The School Principal
The Teacher
Recent Changes
Other Educational Functionaries
Teachers' Organizations

V. GROWTH OF VARIOUS SCHOOL DIVISIONS 105

Elementary Schools
High Schools
Extensions of High School
Kindergartens
Normal School
Evening Schools
Special Schools
Negro Education
Special Schools for Negroes

TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

Chapter		Page
VI.	SUPERVISION OF INSTRUCTION	157
	Supervision by the Board of Directors Supervision by the Superintendent Supervision Delegated to Subordinates Supervision by Subject-Matter Specialists Supervision by Division Specialists Supervisory Organization from 1920 to 1940 Recent Developments	
VII.	SCHOOL-BUILDING PROGRAM	172
	Early School Buildings Effect of Adoption of Graded System Development of School-Building Policy School-Building Construction from 1870-1910 School Buildings for an Expanding Population Construction of Larger Units Attention Focused on Considerations of Security, Safety, and Physical Welfare Housing for Increasing Secondary-School Population Findings of the Strayer Survey School-Building Program from 1910-1940	
VIII.	FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION.	195
	Lands Set Aside for School Purposes Revenue through Taxation Other Sources of Income Management of Fiscal Affairs Educational Costs in St. Louis Compared with Other Cities Recent Developments	
IX.	CONCLUSIONS	221
	The Relation of School Organization to the Legislative Policy of the State The Relation of the Schools to the Municipality The Internal Pattern of School Board Organization The Development of Various Types of Schools The Development of the School Plant The Leadership Provided by the Professional Staff Concluding Statement	
BIBLIOGRAPHY		237

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	The Supervisory Staff for St. Louis Public Schools in Each of Three Periods, 1919-20, 1929-30, and 1939-40.	169
2.	Number of School Units and Enrollment for Selected Years During the Period 1900-1940	190
3.	Receipts and Expenditures for St. Louis Public Schools for Selected Years from 1850 to 1940 . .	210
4.	Expenditures Per Pupil for Six Major Current Expense Accounts During the Year 1943-44 in Ten Selected Cities	219

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/IA41533905_0058

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The problem of establishing and maintaining schools for the education of the people is not new. This matter concerned the early leaders of our country because the success of the type of government which they founded depended upon an enlightened citizenry. To accomplish the education of all the people, schools for the public had to be established. But interest in education did not cease with the mere establishment of schools to provide the rudiments of an education. In order to maintain a place of pre-eminence in the world of nations, educational leaders have sought and are now seeking to establish and maintain schools for the contribution which education makes to our economic and moral well-being.

At the time St. Louis, Missouri, became an organized municipality, the principle of free public education for the children of all the people had not been firmly established. There were those who believed that the free public school was synonymous to the charity school. The education of the Negro at public expense had not been accepted generally throughout the nation as a desirable policy. Only the more enlightened subscribed to providing anything more than the rudiments of education, at public expense, to anybody.

The expensive and complicated system of public education maintained throughout the United States today, thus, had meager beginnings. Today, however, the children of the poor, children of the rich, handicapped children, and most adults are provided free education considerably beyond what was earlier thought to be the rudiments. How one great city met the problem of providing educational opportunities to all these people is the subject of this study.

The city of St. Louis was selected for study for a number of reasons. (1) St. Louis has a history long enough to show development during a period of more than a hundred years. (2) It

is a city which has both a large white and also a good-sized colored population and is located in an area which has not accepted the principle of educating both the white and the colored race in the same schools. (3) Some of the innovations in the public school systems of today took shape and were given considerable impetus in St. Louis. (4) The early leadership provided for the schools in St. Louis made the city ideal for study in showing the development and evolution of public school administration. (5) The printed reports which are available provide complete and detailed accounts of the problems involved in establishing and maintaining the public school system.

There were at first no legal provisions for maintaining public schools, and in some instances there were statutes which actually prohibited certain types of education. There was no group within the community to organize the schools at public expense. Such an organization had to be established, and for that organization a professional staff evolved. The earliest education provided was that given in what we know today as elementary schools. However, education was, in the course of time, extended to provide training in high schools, kindergartens, colleges, special schools, technical schools, and evening schools. The growth of school divisions increased the professional problems which necessitated the attention of trained personnel in a wide variety of areas. The problems of providing school accommodations and paying the increased costs were augmented both by an increasing city population as well as by the provision of increased educational opportunities. All these problems are considered in this study.

It should be pointed out that this study does not comprise a complete history of the St. Louis Public Schools. An attempt has been made, however, to give an account of the major educational developments and the action of those responsible for the management of the schools in the solution of educational problems. It is hoped that the material, as organized, will be beneficial to those who today are concerned in solving some of these same problems, and that some underlying principles may be gained for solving problems which the future may hold.

The materials needed to deal adequately with the problems set forth were obtained from the Annual Reports of the superintendent of instruction and the volumes containing the Official

Proceedings of the Board of Education. Files of newspapers and periodicals were also studied. The volumes of the surveys directed by Dr. Charles H. Judd in 1916 and by Dr. George D. Strayer in 1939 were also of tremendous value in making the study.

In order to show the development of public school administration in the city of St. Louis, it has been necessary to consider (1) the legal basis for the public schools, (2) the organization of the boards, (3) the development of a professional staff, (4) the growth of various school divisions, (5) the development of school supervision, (6) the school building program, and (7) the financial administration of the schools.

CHAPTER II

THE LEGAL BASIS OF THE ST. LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The business of educating the children of St. Louis during the early days was left to various private agencies. Even though the town had become a flourishing fur-trading center at the time of its incorporation, there is no record of the existence of any public school. However, by 1823 the advertisements of private schools seemed to grow less in number with each year and, although the old established schools and seminaries still continued to operate, few new schools were announced.[1]

It is a recognized fact today that the provision of free education for its children is one of the foremost and important duties of the state. This concept of free education, with equal opportunities for both rich and poor, has made the system of education throughout the United States unequal among nations. In return for its expenditure upon the education of its children, the state expects to reap its benefits in the moral uplift of its citizens and in the increase in economic returns.[2]

Subject to constitutional limitations, courts have established the fact that state legislatures have plenary power in matters of educational policy. Unless prohibited by the constitution, the ends to be attained and the means employed to attain the ends are wholly subject to legislative determination. Therefore, the legislature may determine types of schools to be established within its borders, the means of support, the organs of their administration, the content of curriculums, and may make regulations concerning the qualifications of teachers.[3]

In describing the legal and constitutional basis for the

---

[1] J. Thomas Scharf, History of Saint Louis City and County, I, 826. St. Louis: Louis H. Everts & Co., 1883.

[2] Ellwood P. Cubberley, Public School Administration, p. 12. New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1916.

[3] Newton Edwards, The Courts and the Public Schools, pp. 5-6. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1933.

public schools for the city of St. Louis, Missouri, it will be necessary to consider (1) the instruments establishing the schools, (2) measures establishing the management of the schools, (3) provisions for financing the school system, and (4) legislation enacted for extending educational opportunities.

Establishing the Schools

By act of the territorial legislature of Missouri passed January 30, 1817, the board of school trustees for St. Louis was incorporated. Thus was established a special board of school trustees for superintending the schools in the town of St. Louis.[1] The chairman of the special board of school trustees ordered a survey of the plots and advertised in the Missouri Gazette nineteen pieces of land for lease, the same to be rented to the highest bidder on the third of May following. Leasing these lands failed because the board did not have clear and indisputable title to the property.[2]

Education was given an impetus by the constitution of 1820. Article VI of that document provided that,

> Schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged in this state; and the general assembly shall take measures to preserve from waste or damage such lands as have been, or hereafter may be granted by the United States for the use of schools within each township in this state, and shall apply the funds which may arise from such lands in strict conformity to the object of the grant: one school, or more shall be established in each township as soon as practicable and necessary, where the poor shall be taught gratis.[3]

While the constitution of 1820 did not provide for establishing a system of free public schools for all, it did provide a basis for later development and expansion. An act approved by the state legislature in February, 1833, repealed the Act of January 30, 1817, which had incorporated a "Board of Trustees for Superintending the Schools in the Town of St. Louis." Through the new legislation all free white persons residing within the city of St. Louis were constituted a body politic and corporate

---

[1] Laws of Missouri, 1804-1824, Vol. I, p. 521.

[2] First Annual Report of the General Superintendent of the St. Louis Public Schools, 1854, pp. 97-100.

[3] Revised Statutes, State of Missouri, 1834-1835, p. 24.

called, "The Board of President and Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools." The powers of the board were invested in the president and directors who were required to be free white male citizens. To this group was given the powers for establishing and managing the schools for the purposes of education.[1]

By 1865 the concept of a free public school system had been well established and provisions were made for the same in the constitution of 1865. Article IX of the constitution is quoted in part, herewith:

> Section 1. A general diffusion of Knowledge and Intelligence being essential to the preservation of the rights and liberties of the people, the general assembly shall establish and maintain free schools for the gratuitous instruction of all persons in this state between the ages of five and twenty-one years.
>
> Section 2. Separate schools may be established for children of African descent. All funds provided for the support of public schools shall be appropriated in proportion to the number of children, without regard to color.[2]

Thus, free education was guaranteed, not only to white children, but to colored children as well.

A general revision of the laws was made in March, 1866, and, as a result, provisions were made in definite language for the erection and management of central or high schools throughout the state.[3] These provisions were retained in subsequent amendments of 1870 and 1874 and in the revision of 1875.

The new constitution of the state of Missouri, adopted by a vote of the people October 30, 1875, went into effect on November 20 of that year.[4] Some changes over the previous constitutional provisions were made for education. Section 2 stated that public schools should be established for Negro children, and, whereas the constitution of 1865 had provided for the free instruction of all persons between the ages of five and twenty-one, the new constitution set the age limits at six and twenty years. Further, the newly adopted constitution provided that no appropriation of any sort could be made for any religious creed, church,

---

[1] Laws of Missouri, 1824-1836, Vol. II, pp. 399-401.

[2] Revised Statutes, State of Missouri, 1866, p. 40.

[3] Ibid., pp. 261-62.

[4] Revised Statutes, State of Missouri, 1879, Vol. I, p. lii.

or sectarian purpose.[1]

The board of directors construed the constitution as meaning that education was required for persons between the age of six and twenty-one and permissible for those below or beyond those ages. The supreme court of Missouri decided that such was not the case. In a case brought before it, the court decided that the first section of Article 10 of the constitution of 1875, which required gratuitous instruction to all between the ages of six and twenty years, and the sixth section, which declared that the public school fund should be faithfully appropriated for establishing and maintaining the free public schools and for no other purposes, meant that the board was prohibited from providing gratuitous instruction from the public school fund to children under the age of six years.[2]

Management of the Schools

The act, approved January 30, 1817, was the first step taken to provide management for the schools in the town of St. Louis. By this act, Messrs. William Clark, William C. Carr, Thomas H. Benton, Bernard Pratte, Auguste Chouteau, Alexander M'Nair, and John P. Cabanne, and such other persons duly appointed constituted a board of trustees for regulation of the schools. As a body corporate and politic they had full power to take and to hold real or personal property given for the use of schools, and to lease, rent, or dispose of, to the best advantage, lands given by Congress for the support of schools and to apply proceeds in the establishment and maintenance of schools. Further, the board of trustees was empowered to employ teachers and to adopt rules for the government of the schools.

Provisions were made for this body to fill any vacancies occurring in the membership or to add members needed, providing the number of trustees did not exceed thirteen. They were empowered to adopt rules for meetings and to take such steps as they considered necessary to support the schools. They were required to keep a record of their meetings and to account for funds to

---

[1] Ibid., pp. lxxx-lxxxiv.

[2] Roach v. Board of President and Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, 77 Missouri 484 (April, 1883).

the legislature of the territory.[1]

The act of January 30, 1817, was repealed by an act of the state legislature passed on February 13, 1833. Through this legislation the board of trustees was replaced by "The Board of President and Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools." The powers of the corporation established were vested in a president and directors who were required to be free white males at least twenty-one years of age, and who had resided previous to their election at least twelve months within the city, as taxpaying citizens.

Each ward within the city was entitled, according to provisions of the act, to two members on the board to be elected at the same time as the mayor and aldermen of St. Louis were elected. However, no mayor or alderman was eligible for election to the board. Voters in the election were required to be over the age of twenty-one and to be free white male citizens with one year's previous residence as a taxpayer within the city. Members were elected for periods of three years, with one-third of the membership retiring at the end of each year. Members of the first board were instructed to determine by lot which should serve for one, two, or three years.

The act specified that four stated meetings were to be held each year and that special meetings could be called by the president or by any three members of the board by giving one week's notice in writing to other members of the board. The board was further empowered to fill vacancies by an election conducted by the board according to stated provisions.

The following powers were delegated to the board of president and directors of the St. Louis public schools: (1) to judge the qualifications, elections, and returns of members; (2) to prescribe the time, place, and manner of conducting elections of members in the various wards of the city; (3) to compel attendance of absent members at meetings; (4) to punish members for disorderly conduct in meetings; (5) to expel a member for cause by vote of two-thirds of all members elected; (6) to make rules for the government of their own proceedings; (7) to have charge and control of the public schools and all property appropriated to the use of said schools within the city; (8) to make all rules, ordinances, and statutes proper for the government and management of schools

---

[1]Laws of Missouri, 1804-1824, Vol. I, pp. 521-22.

and property in accordance with the laws of the land; and (9) to do all lawful acts proper or convenient to carry into effect the object of the corporation. It was a further duty of the board, as stated in the law, to take possession, charge, and control of all lands or lots in or near the city of St. Louis, which had been or at some future time might be granted to the inhabitants of St. Louis for school purposes by the Congress of the United States. The board was also authorized to dispose of any such lands and apply proceeds to the purposes of education under provisions of the act. Title to all such lands and lots controlled by the general assembly was vested in the corporation created by the act.

The act of 1833 further stipulated that the members of the board should elect one of their members president and appoint a treasurer and secretary and such other servants and agents which the board deemed necessary to accomplish the objects of the corporation. The powers, duties, obligations, and compensation of these agents were to be determined by the board. The legislature required that a true and faithful record be kept of all acts and proceedings of the board, and that the same be furnished to the general assembly or either branch of it whenever required. Likewise, upon the receipt of a written application signed by one hundred qualified electors of the city, the board could be required to lay a proposition before the inhabitants of the city and call a general election for considering the proposition. The board of president and directors was required to publish at least once each year a true statement of the conditions of the public schools under their charge and of all property under their control as well as an account of all money concerns of the corporation.[1]

The act of 1833 was amended on March 17, 1845, by the general assembly of the state of Missouri as follows: (1) Membership on the board of school directors of the city of St. Louis was denied to any member of the board of aldermen or the board of delegates and to all other persons holding office under the city of St. Louis, whether elected or appointed. (2) Persons eligible for membership on the board were required to be residents of the ward from which elected for a period of twelve months prior to their election. Members moving from wards from which they were

---

[1] Laws of Missouri, 1824-1836, Vol. II, pp. 399-401.

elected were required to vacate and to have elections arranged by the board to fill such vacancies. (3) Directors were prohibited from borrowing money directly or indirectly from the corporation. (4) Members violating the acts of 1845 or 1833 were to be disqualified from membership on the board and punished as provided by law. (5) Directors were prohibited from receiving compensation for any services as directors.[1] Another amendatory act was passed on March 26, 1845, which prohibited any director in the corporation from maintaining any interest in the property of the corporation or any title adverse to the title of the property claimed by the corporation. Section 2 of the act further provided that,

> No person who is, or may hereafter become, a Director, or who shall hold any other office in or under said corporation, shall purchase or lease from said corporation any property claimed by said corporation, nor shall any such person be interested, directly or indirectly, in any purchase or lease by any other person of any such property, and any sale or lease of any such property, in which any such Director or other person is so interested, shall be utterly null and void.[2]

The act of November 21, 1857, redefined the qualifications of voters for members of the board of president and directors of the St. Louis public schools. Whereas, qualified electors under a previous act were required to have resided within the city for a period of twelve months and a like period of residence within a given ward, the new act required a residence of only six months within the city and of one month within the ward wherein they voted. Voters under this act, however, were privileged to vote only within the ward in which they resided.[3]

The number of school directors was decreased as a result of the passage of the act of March 30, 1887. The number of directors had previously depended upon the number of wards within the city. Section 1 of the new legislation provided that the number of school directors in cities the size of St. Louis would be twenty-one. Of that number, seven were to be elected from the city at large on a general ticket and fourteen were to be elected by districts. Section 2 provided that the districting of cities should be placed in the hands of the circuit court, the secretary

---

[1] Local Laws and Private Acts of the State of Missouri, 1845, pp. 182-83.

[2] Ibid., p. 194. [3] Laws of Missouri, 1857, p. 490.

of the board to be notified upon its completion of the districting. Provisions were also included to provide for a rotation plan at the first election under the provisions of the act so that not all members would retire from office within any one year.[1]

The management of the St. Louis schools was carried on under the basic provisions of the act of 1833 until its repeal by an act approved by the legislature on March 23, 1897. Sections 2, 3, and 4 of that act are quoted herewith:

> Section 2. Every city in this State now having or which may hereafter have three hundred thousand inhabitants or over, together with the territory now within its limits, or which may in the future be included by any change thereof, shall be and constitute a single school district, shall be a body corporate, and the supervision and government of public schools and public school property therein, shall be vested in a board of twelve members, to be called and known as the Board of Education of _____ (in which title the name of such city shall be inserted), and in a Superintendent of Instruction and a Commissioner of School Buildings. Such Board of Education shall, by and in said name, sue and be sued, purchase, receive, hold and sell property, do all things necessary to accomplish the purpose for the attainment of which such school district is organized, and succeed to all the property, rights and privileges of whatever kind and nature, granted and belonging to any previous corporation, Board of Directors, or school district in such city, or officers thereof, authorized or empowered by any enactment of the General Assembly of the State to do anything in reference to public education: Provided, that all pending suits to which any such previous corporation, Board of Directors, or school district, or officer thereof, is a party, may be prosecuted to an end in the name of such party. All titles to property previously granted to such city by the United States, or this State, for school purposes, and the title to all school lands and other property of every kind, shall be vested in the Board of Education established by this act.
>
> Section 3. Every such Board of Education shall have general and supervising control, government, and management of the public schools and public school property in such city; shall exercise generally all powers in the administration of the public school system therein, appoint such officers, agents, and employees as it may deem necessary and proper, and fix their compensation; shall have power to fix the time of its meetings, to make, amend, and repeal rules and by-laws for its meetings and proceedings, for the government, regulation, and management of the public schools and school property in such city, for the transaction of its business, and the examination, qualification, and employment of teachers, which rules and by-laws shall be binding on such Board of Education and all parties dealing with it until formally repealed; to provide for special and standing committees, to loan its funds, and to levy such taxes as are or may be authorized by law for

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 273-74.

school purposes; and to purchase and hold all property, real and personal, deemed by it necessary for the purposes of public education, or for the investment of the public school funds, to build and construct improvements for such purposes, and to sell the same. Such Board of Education shall have all the powers of other school districts under the laws of this State except as herein provided.

Section 4. The members of such Board of Education shall be elected from such city at large on a general ticket and shall be at least thirty years of age, citizens and residents of the city and taxpayers therein on property therein assessed in their individual names, and shall have been such residents, citizens, and taxpayers for at least three years immediately preceding their election. They shall not hold any office, except that of notary public, in such city or State, nor be interested in any contract with or claim against the Board, either directly or indirectly. If at any time after the election of any member of said Board he becomes interested in any contract with or claim against the Board, either directly or indirectly, or as agent or employee of any individual, firm, or corporation, which is so interested, he shall thereupon be disqualified to continue as a member of said Board, and shall continue to be so disqualified during the remainder of the term for which he was elected. Every member of such Board shall, before assuming the duties of his office, take oath before a judge of the Circuit Court, or justice of the peace of such city, which oath shall be kept of record in such Board, that he possesses all of the qualifications by this act required, and that he will not, while serving as a member of such Board, directly or indirectly, or as agent or employee of any individual, firm, or corporation which is so interested, and that he will not be influenced, during his term of office, by any consideration except that of merit and fitness in the appointment of officers and the engagement of employees. No compensation shall be paid to the members of the Board, but they shall be exempt from jury duty and from service as election officers during their term of office.[1]

The act further provided that it should be the duty of the board of education, as soon as practicable after its organization, to appoint a superintendent of public instruction, a commissioner of school buildings, a secretary and treasurer, an auditor, and such other officers, employees, and agents as the board considered necessary. The board was required to elect one of its members president and another vice-president at its first regular meeting after the first day of October. Vacancies occurring were to be filled by the mayor by appointment until the next election for members of the board, at which time the vacancy would be filled by election.

The charter, as stipulated by the act of 1897, outlines the powers and duties of the superintendent of instruction, the

---

[1] Laws of Missouri, 1897, pp. 221-22.

commissioner of school buildings, the secretary and treasurer, and the auditor. This matter was not left to the discretion of the board of education.[1] These duties, as outlined, will be discussed later in this study in the chapter entitled "Organization of the Boards."

Provisions for Financing Education

By an act of Congress, passed on June 13, 1812, the board of trustees gained possession of considerable property in the area of St. Louis. This law provided for a survey in order to identify all town or village lots, out-lots or commonfield lots not rightfully owned or claimed by private individuals or towns or villages. It further provided that all such lands should be reserved for the support of schools in the respective towns or villages, provided that the entire amount of land in any one town or village did not exceed one-twentieth part of the whole lands included in the survey of such town or village.[2] Supplementary to this act was the act of May 26, 1824, which required that individual owners or claimants prove their ownership within a given time, and after the expiration of the same required the Surveyor General to designate vacant lots unclaimed and not specified for military purposes.[3] The Congress of the United States, on January 27, 1831, relinquished title to all unclaimed and unowned property reserved for the support of schools. The legislature of the state was empowered to sell, dispose of, or regulate the lands.[4]

It was stated earlier that the board of directors was empowered by the act of 1833 to take possession and control of all lands or lots which had been granted to the inhabitants of St. Louis for school purposes. Supplementary to the act of 1833, the general assembly enacted legislation on January 27, 1835, which is quoted herewith:

---

[1] Ibid., p. 223.

[2] Public Statutes at Large of the United States of America, 1800-1813, Vol. II, pp. 749-50. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1856.

[3] Public Statutes at Large of the United States of America, 1824-1835, Vol. IV, p. 435. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1856.

[4] Ibid.

> Section 1. From and after the passage of this act, it shall be lawful for the Board of President and Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools to lend the money arising from the sale or lease of the lands placed under their charge by law for the purpose of education in that city, from time to time, not exceeding the term of one year, at an interest not exceeding ten per cent per annum, on good security, either real or personal, or both, until it shall become proper, in the opinion of the Board, to invest such money otherwise for the purposes of education in St. Louis.[1]

While the revenues from these lands were beneficial to the cause of education within the city of St. Louis, it soon became evident to the board of directors that the amount being received would not be sufficient to support adequately the number of schools which seemed to be necessary. Consequently, a committee of the board requested the general assembly to enact legislation which would permit the levying of a local tax for the benefit of education.[2] The efforts of the committee resulted in the passage of a law by the assembly on February 13, 1849, which permitted the levying of a tax within the city not to exceed one-tenth of 1 per cent on all real and personal property. The collector of St. Louis County was required to collect the tax, according to provisions of the law, and to pay the same to the board of president and directors of the St. Louis schools to be used by them for school purposes. The law provided, however, that no such tax could be authorized except by approval of the qualified voters within the city at an election called for that purpose. Justices of the peace in St. Louis were empowered to hold this election.[3] The tax levy proposed was adopted by the overwhelming vote of five to one.[4]

On December 17, 1863, the general assembly increased the former rate of one-tenth of 1 per cent to one-fifth of 1 per cent.[5] A further increase to one-half of 1 per cent was authorized on December 19, 1865, and empowered the board of president and di-

---

[1] Private and Local Acts of the State of Missouri, 1835, p. 37.

[2] Thirteenth Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, 1867, p. 108.

[3] Laws of Missouri, 1849, pp. 397-98.

[4] Thirteenth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 107.

[5] Laws of Missouri, 1863-1864, p. 656.

rectors to determine the rate of taxation each year, within the provisions of the law.[1]

When the constitution of 1875 was adopted by the state, Article X of that document specified in Section 11 that the annual tax rate on property should not exceed forty cents on the hundred dollars valuation.[2] This was an amount less than had been levied for several years. However, it was not until several years later that an amendment was proposed by the state legislature to the voters which revised the constitution of 1875 by raising the limit of taxation to sixty cents on the hundred dollars valuation.[3] The amendment was submitted to the voters in November, 1902. The passage of this amendment was the result of many years of deliberation and effort on the part of the president and board of directors of the St. Louis public schools. Further increase required the approval of the voters each year the increase was to be in force.[4] On May 30, 1921, the legislature approved an act which provided that when the majority of voters at an election approved an increase, the board would be permitted to establish that rate for the ensuing four years. The board was also empowered to lower the rate if it was deemed desirable within the period.[5]

The state of Missouri subscribed in positive manner to the organization and support of free public schools through an act passed on February 24, 1853. Through this act, the state created a permanent school fund and provided that only the interest, dividend, and proceeds should be distributed for support of common schools throughout the state. In addition 25 per cent of the state revenue was reserved annually to become state school moneys and distributed for the support of organized schools. The act provided that the state superintendent should take charge of appropriating the money and make a division of it according to the number of white children above the age of five and under the

---

[1] Laws of Missouri, 1865-1866, pp. 272-73.

[2] Revised Statutes, State of Missouri, 1879, p. lxxxi.

[3] Laws of Missouri, 1901, p. 266.

[4] Forty-ninth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, 1903, pp. 10-11.

[5] Laws of Missouri, 1921, p. 632.

age of twenty years.[1] Apportionment of this fund was temporarily halted during the Civil War, but continued thereafter.[2]

By an act passed May 16, 1879, the legislature removed any doubt which existed concerning the status of all government land grants. The act stated that:

> Section 1. All school lands heretofore granted, by the General Assembly, to any city or town, or to any incorporated board for the benefit of any city or town, or the inhabitants thereof, for the purposes of education, including all lands set apart or granted by the general government of the United States to this state, and lying within the limits of such city or town, for support of schools, and granted to or placed in charge of such city, town, or incorporated board as aforesaid, shall constitute the permanent school fund of such city or town, only the income of which shall be used for the support of public schools in such city or town.
>
> Section 2. Nothing herein contained shall affect the existing right of any city or town or incorporated board to dispose of such land: Provided, that the proceeds be duly invested, and only the income thereof used for the support of schools.[3]

Extending Educational Opportunities

The limits to which the city might go in providing education for its children were not too well defined by the earliest legislation, which seemed to be concerned with management of the various land grants, establishment of corporations for the management of schools, and provisions for supporting the schools. However, on March 19, 1835, an act was passed which dealt with schools and school lands. One of the provisions of this act stated that in all schools established in accordance with the act should be taught reading, writing, arithmetic, geography, English grammar, and such other branches of education, with the exception of theology, as the funds might justify.[4] It was apparent through this act that the state was interested in the teaching of fundamental subjects and keeping such instruction free from sectarianism.

It was natural that, after the close of the Civil War, the state of Missouri should concern itself with the education of its

---

[1] Laws of Missouri, 1852-1853, pp. 147-51.

[2] Laws of Missouri, 1863-1864, p. 105.

[3] Laws of Missouri, 1879, p. 205.

[4] Revised Statutes, State of Missouri, 1834-1835, p. 568.

Negro children. The constitution of 1865 had provided for the establishment of separate schools for children of African descent and for which apportionment of state moneys would be made without regard to color.[1]

The first high school had been established in St. Louis in 1853, which was soon after the citizens of the city had voted to tax themselves for the support of education.[2] It was not until March 29, 1866, that the general assembly passed specific regulations concerning the establishing of high schools. With that act it became legal to establish one or more high schools when needed within the district.[3]

On March 19, 1870, the state legislature passed an act which made possible the establishment of normal schools. Section 2 of the act not only provided for the establishment of normal schools but further stated that model schools might be operated in connection with these institutions for the purpose of providing training for teachers.[4] An act passed March 17, 1875, concerns the provision of high-school and normal instruction for colored, and is quoted herewith:

> Section 1. The Board of president and directors of the St. Louis public schools shall make suitable provision for the education of the colored children of said city; and for the purpose of educating the colored children of said city, in the advanced studies, the said board shall provide for and maintain a high school, and shall, if necessary, erect a building for that purpose.
>
> Section 2. For the purpose of training teachers, the said board of president and directors of the St. Louis public schools are hereby authorized to establish and maintain, in the high school provided for in the foregoing section, a department of normal instruction.[5]

Expanding educational opportunities within the city met with some opposition. There were those who did not believe the board had any right to extend instruction beyond the rudimentary subjects of training. A suit was brought against the board of

---

[1] Revised Statutes, State of Missouri, 1866, p. 40.

[2] Thirteenth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 109.

[3] Laws of Missouri, 1865-1866, pp. 176-77.

[4] Laws of Missouri, 1870, pp. 136-37.

[5] Laws of Missouri, 1875, p. 349.

president and directors of the St. Louis public schools, the object of which was to restrain them from expending its revenues and resources in teaching in the schools the languages, arts, sciences, and various enumerated branches of education specified. The supreme court held that the school funds, from whatever sources derived, were originally granted for the support of schools, unaccompanied by any condition, expressed or implied, that the schools should be restricted to teaching the elementary branches of an English education. The court further held that the legislature of the state had the power of prescribing what should or should not be taught in the schools and that such power did not rest with the court. The legislature was considered to have the power to prescribe, from time to time, any modification and changes it deemed necessary, subject only to the constitution of the state. In its decision, the court ruled that the term "common," when applied to schools, was used to denote that the schools be open and public to all, rather than to indicate the grade of the school or what might or might not be taught in them.[1]

On April 11, 1905, the general assembly of the state passed an act to enforce the constitutional right of every child in the state to an education, to provide for truant or parental schools, and to permit employment of attendance officers in cities of ten thousand or more population, and to prohibit the employment of children during school hours. Section 1, made it compulsory for parents, guardians, and others in control of children between the ages of eight and fourteen to send them to school regularly for not less than one-half of the entire time schools were in session, and extended to sixteen years compulsory attendance of children not employed. Conditions of poverty and feeble-mindedness on the part of children were considered mitigating circumstances. Section 4 empowered boards in cities over ten thousand population to establish one or more ungraded truant or parental schools within or without school boundaries. Section 7 provided that no child could be employed in industry without a certificate from the superintendent of schools stating that such employment was considered by him to be within the provisions of the law.[2] Four

---

[1] Roach v. Board of President and Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, 77 Missouri 474 (April, 1883).

[2] Laws of Missouri, 1905, pp. 146-47.

years later this act was amended by one which increased compulsory attendance to three-quarters of the school session instead of the one-half specified by the act of 1905.[1]

The legislature also passed an act authorizing boards, upon the petition of fifty or more free holders, to establish free night schools and to fix the rates of tuition for students over twenty years of age. Boards of education were authorized, further, to grant the use of any public school buildings to any responsible parties for the purpose of conducting free night schools.[2]

Since the adoption of the constitution of 1875, the board had been prevented from providing gratuitous education to children less than six and more than twenty years of age. As early as 1883 the board pointed out that the age limitations could be eliminated by the passage of a constitutional amendment, and urged that it be done for the benefit of the community.[3] It was not until 1913 that the board succeeded in securing the passage of an act which enabled the board to extend its educational opportunities. The new legislation provided that children between the ages of five and six and those over twenty could receive gratuitous education financed only from revenues derived by such school districts from sources other than those described in Section 6, Article XI, of the constitution of the state, and only with so much of such revenues as are not required for maintaining the education of those between six and twenty.[4]

Beginning with the year 1917, the state legislature passed a number of acts which enabled the various school districts to utilize the provisions of federal laws pertaining to vocational education. The first of these passed accepted the requirements and benefits relating to appropriations in the states for instruction in agriculture, the trades and industries, as well as home economics. The state board of education was authorized (1) to promote and aid in the establishment and maintenance of public prevocational and vocational schools, departments, and classes giving instruction in agriculture, industrial, home economics, and

---

[1] Laws of Missouri, 1909, p. 847. [2] Ibid., p. 849.

[3] Twenty-ninth Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, 1868, pp. 22-23.

[4] Laws of Missouri, 1913, p. 717.

commercial subjects; and (2) to co-operate in the maintenance of schools, departments, and classes, supported and controlled by the public for the preparation of teachers and supervisors of such subjects.[1] On May 29, 1919, the state legislature appropriated an amount equal to the federal appropriation ($205,820.75) for the biennial period ending December 31, 1921, and authorized the use of this money to promote vocational education including the payment of salaries and other necessary expenses for adequate supervision and administration.[2]

Legislation passed during this period also recognized the rights of children to special education. Boards were authorized to provide instruction for defective, blind, deaf, and crippled children. In providing instruction for such children, an amount of $750.00 was provided for each trained teacher employed by boards in carrying out the provisions of this act.[3] About the same time boards were authorized to establish lunch rooms. The provisions of that act stated:

> The Board of directors, or board of education, shall have the power, in its discretion, to install in the school buildings under its care the necessary apparatus and appliances, and to purchase the necessary food to enable it to provide and sell lunches to children attending the schools; provided, however, that such lunches shall not be sold for a less price than the cost of the food, exclusive of the cost of the necessary apparatus and appliances and exclusive of costs necessary and incidental to the purchase of the food and the preparing and service of the lunches.[4]

Action was taken by the state legislature in 1895 to provide teachers' pensions.[5] An amendatory act was passed in 1897 which set forth further provisions for operation of the act. As amended, it provided that teachers and administrative and clerical employees in cities of more than three hundred thousand population could participate in the pension plan. Boards in such cities were empowered to set aside the following moneys for that purpose: (1) an amount not exceeding 1 per cent per annum of the respective salaries paid to teachers and administrative and clerical

---

[1] Laws of Missouri, 1917, p. 513.

[2] Laws of Missouri, 1919, p. 703.

[3] Laws of Missouri, 1921, pp. 630-32. [4] Ibid., p. 66.

[5] Laws of Missouri, 1895, pp. 268-70.

employees who volunteered to participate; (2) all moneys received from donations, legacies, gifts, bequests, or other sources on account of the fund; and (3) all moneys which might be derived from other methods duly and legally devised for increasing the fund.

A board of trustees was to be created with power to handle pension matters. Boards of education, upon a majority vote of all members, could retire any female teachers or other administrative and clerical employee participating in the fund who had taught in public schools for a twenty-five-year period, and any male teacher could be retired who had rendered service over a thirty-year-period, provided the board of trustees judged such individuals to be mentally or physically incapacitated for service. Any individuals to receive pensions were required to have spent four-fifths of the term within the municipality where the board had jurisdiction.

Annuitants were entitled to receive 60 per cent of the annual salary paid at the time of their retirement, provided the annuity did not exceed the sum of eight hundred dollars. Further, no person was entitled to become an annuitant if he had not paid into the treasury a sum equal to 25 per cent of the annual salary received by him at the time of making application for the annuity.[1] No provision was made for any direct financial support from boards of education.

The board of directors of the St. Louis schools reported that, after investigation, the terms of the pension law were inadequate for the purposes intended and likely to be delusive to those who might seek to obtain its proposed benefits. It was pointed out that the law carried no adequate safeguards to prevent financial failure of the plan.[2] Consequently, a new act was proposed to provide financial safeguards and to permit the board to contribute an amount equal to that paid by participants. The act passed the legislature but was vetoed by the governor who held that the constitution stated in plain and emphatic language that no public money should be used by the state or any municipality as a gift or gratuity to any individual, association of individ-

---

[1] Laws of Missouri, 1897, p. 232.

[2] Forty-fifth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, Missouri, 1899, p. 23.

uals, or corporations.[1]

In 1909, a constitutional amendment was provided which would have modified the basic law to the extent of permitting public moneys to be used in creating a pension for teachers.[2] This amendment was defeated at an election held in November, 1910.[3]

Recent Constitutional and Legislative Enactments

One of the most fundamental recent legislative enactments was known as House Bill No. 373 which pertains to the tenure of teachers. The law provides that the first three years of employment of all teachers and principals after September, 1943, shall be known as a probationary period. During the probationary period each teacher or principal must be appointed each year and the contract expires at the close of the year. During the time of probation any such teacher or principal whose work is unsatisfactory must be furnished by the superintendent of instruction with a written statement setting forth the nature of his incompetency. If within one semester after notification the improvement is not satisfactory to the superintendent, such probationary teacher or principal shall be dismissed. Further, the superintendent of instruction is required by this law to notify by the fifteenth of April any probationary teacher or principal who will not be retained by the school district at the termination of his contract year. If proper notification is not given, the individual is automatically appointed for the next school year. After the completion of a satisfactory probationary service, appointments shall become permanent, subject to removal only for causes enumerated within the act.

After appointments become permanent, the following are listed as just causes for removal: immorality, inefficiency in line of duty, violation of the published regulations of the school district, violation of the laws of Missouri governing the public schools of said state, or physical or mental condition which inca-

---

[1] Forty-seventh Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, Missouri, 1901, p. 44.

[2] Laws of Missouri, 1909, p. 908.

[3] Sixty-first Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, 1918, p. 322.

pacitates him for instructing or associating with children, and then only by a vote of not less than a majority of all the members of the board, upon written charges presented by the superintendent of instruction, to be heard by the board after thirty days' notice, with copy of the charges served upon the person against whom they are preferred, who shall have the privilege of being present, together with counsel, offering evidence and making defense thereto.[1]

As a consequence of the failure to obtain proper legislation to set up an adequate retirement plan, the law permits the board to retire elderly teachers. This provision stated,

> . . . . provided, however, that if no such retirement system shall be in operation, teachers or principals now in service seventy (70) years of age and over and those who shall hereinafter attain the age of seventy (70) years shall, automatically, until September 1, 1945, be assigned to such position and at such compensation as may be recommended by the Superintendent of Instruction and approved by the board. If, on September 1, 1945, there is no such retirement system established, all such teachers and principals who have then attained or who shall thereafter attain the age of seventy (70) years, shall be deemed to be upon a leave of absence without compensation.[2]

At the same session of the legislature, a bill was passed which provided for the creation, maintenance, and administration of a public school retirement system in districts of 700,000 or more which was applicable to the St. Louis school district. The bill as enacted contains provisions concerning: (1) payments to employees of the boards of education in said school districts and to designated beneficiaries; (2) disqualification of any member of said boards of education who shall be interested in any contract with or claim against any such retirement system in his school district; (3) definitions of the terms used in the act; (4) individuals eligible to benefits and what benefits shall be payable; (5) guaranties by said school districts of the benefits payable and expenses; (6) method of financing and the creation and disposition of certain funds; (7) contributions from members and appropriations by such school districts to finance such retirement systems; (8) creation of boards of trustees to manage and

---

[1] State of Missouri School Laws of 62nd General Assembly, 1943, pp. 24-26.

[2] Ibid., p. 26.

administer such retirement systems and prescribing their powers, duties, and mode of procedure; (9) method and extent of judicial review of the action of said board of trustees; (10) penalties for participation in the fraudulent falsification of any record of such retirement systems; (11) exemption of benefits under such retirement systems from attachment, execution, garnishment, or other legal process, and from taxation; (12) prohibition of the state of Missouri from contributing funds to finance the retirement systems established by this act, except funds which the districts may receive under a law or laws providing for a general apportionment of school moneys throughout all the state.[1]

The state constitution adopted in 1945 contains some new provisions for education. The maximum age limit for pupils in the public schools is increased from twenty to twenty-one years. No minimum age is provided. The minimum under the old constitution was six years. Provisions are made for adult education and for area schools giving special training in trades and crafts and training for underprivileged or handicapped children. The new maximum tax rate for school purposes in the city of St. Louis is established at eighty-nine cents. The voters may increase the rate by a two-thirds majority vote but the general assembly may place restrictions on such an increase. In addition, special levies may be authorized by law for library, health, recreation, and museum purposes.[2]

One of the latest legislative enactments was the result of several years of effort to accomplish a more equitable distribution of state school funds. Under the new law, St. Louis received approximately $600,000 more than formerly.[3]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 54-55.

[2] Proposed New Constitution Adopted by the 1943-1944 Constitutional Convention of Missouri, pp. 11-13.

[3] Ninetieth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, Missouri, 1944, p. 14.

CHAPTER III

ORGANIZATION OF THE BOARDS

St. Louis was incorporated as a city in 1822.[1] However, it was some years after its incorporation that any public schools were established. The number of flourishing private schools may have lessened the apparent need for establishing public schools. Many of the private schools remained strong after 1823, although by that time there appeared to be fewer new private schools coming into existence.[2]

In commenting upon the greatness of the city of St. Louis in this early period, one historian states:

> Over all this rising greatness hung a dark curtain. St. Louis had no Public School. The streets swarmed with idle children and public school lands laid unoccupied in the most populous parts of the city; but a luminous day was near at hand that has quite dispelled the gloomy prospect. In March of this year the Legislature authorized the people of St. Louis--as it was bounded in 1812--who owned lots to authorize the City Council to sell the town Commons, a tract of about two thousand acres of most beautiful grounds, and to appropriate nine-tenths to the improvement of the streets of the city and one-tenth to the support of Public Schools. This trifling sum, however, raised the curtain and laid the foundation for the first Public Schools of St. Louis, by which the whole population of the city was enlightened in regard to the advantages of a well-regulated Public School system and induced to vote a tax on themselves to establish the present Public Schools.[3]

Early Organizations

As the result of an act incorporating the board of trustees for superintending schools in the town of St. Louis, General

---

[1] J. N. Taylor and M. O. Crooks, Sketch Book of Saint Louis, p.17. St. Louis: George Knapp & Co., 1858.

[2] Scharf, op. cit., p. 826.

[3] Elihu H. Shepard, The Early History of St. Louis and Missouri, p. 114. St. Louis: Southwestern Book & Publishing Co., 1870.

William Clark, William C. Carr, Col. Thomas H. Benton, Bernard Pratte, Auguste Chouteau, Alexander McNair, and John P. Cabanne became trustees. General Clark called a meeting of the trustees on April 4, 1817, at which time he was elected chairman. Thomas H. Benton was appointed secretary pro tempore until a permanent appointment should be made. The secretary was instructed to obtain from the Surveyor General's office, a plat of the survey of the town of St. Louis showing such lands as might be set aside for the support of public schools as provided by the act of 1812. The secretary was further instructed at this meeting to procure a book for the purpose of recording the proceedings of the board. This record was procured and kept but was subsequently lost so that little is known of the transactions of the board. It is known that Col. Benton acted as secretary of the board until February 15, 1827, when he resigned. Joseph V. Garnier was elected to succeed him as secretary, but it is probable that the board did not meet after April 5, 1828.[1]

While no public schools were actually established during the period in which this group was active, it is to this board of trustees that the lands, which later made up the bulk of the permanent fund, were preserved for the public schools. Lands were surveyed, claimed, and leases made to various individuals.[2]

Organization of Board Pursuant to Act of 1833

The act establishing a corporation in the city of St. Louis, for the purposes of public education, passed February 13, 1833, has been described in a previous chapter. Pursuant to Section 4 of this act, the board of president and directors established the rules governing the board in establishing the St. Louis public schools.[3]

The rules of the board stated that at its first regular meeting in July of each year, or as soon thereafter as possible, there should be elected by ballot a president, vice-president, secretary, treasurer, attorney, superintendent, and bailiff, who would hold their respective offices for the period of one year, and until their successors were duly qualified and elected.

---

[1] First Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 43-44.

[2] Ibid., p. 44.

[3] Ibid., p. 46.

President.--The president was required to preside at all meetings of the board, to preserve order, to rigidly enforce the rules, sign all bonds, notes, agreements, deeds, or leases ordered to be executed by the board, to sign all warrants drawn on the treasurer, and to appoint all standing and all special committees, when not otherwise provided for. The vice-president was required to perform all of the duties of the president in his absence, disability, or resignation.

Secretary.--The secretary was required to furnish to the judges and the clerk at each of the respective polls, in all elections, a printed form of certificates of return and a box for holding the ballots, together with a book for the names of the voters. After receiving the returns of the elections, it was his duty to properly notify the board and provide, pursuant to the rules, for a proper election.

He was required to keep a correct record of the proceedings of the board, in a book for that specific purpose, and to keep an index for the same. He was responsible for publishing in at least two daily newspapers such proceedings as the board directed. All public acts of the president were to be attested to by him, and timely notices of all board and committee meetings were to be prepared by him. All furniture, deeds, books, letters, and other papers belonging to the corporation were to be taken possession of by him and to be kept in good order, subject at all times to the order of the board and examination by any member of it. All communications were to be preserved and presented at the meeting subsequent to their receipt.

He was required, also, to make out all accounts for moneys due the corporation, and to deliver and charge the same to the bailiff. The board was to be furnished at its regular meetings a balance sheet of his books and to preserve them for future reference. At the end of the fiscal year the board required a statement of the lands in its possession whether held by fee simple or under lease, how disposed of, and the quantity and location of all unleased lands. In connection with the leasing of lands, it was his duty to draw all leases given by the board and keep informed concerning lands available for any use determined by the board. In connection with the bailiff, diligent means were to be used in negotiating with parties applying for leasing of properties at not less than the minimum fee set by the leasing committee, and to

submit such transactions to that committee for reporting to the board for its approval.

In conjunction with the superintendent, it was the duty of the secretary to keep a registry of the names and addresses of all applicants for employment as teachers, of the positions applied for in each case, and to issue notices to such applicants indicating the time and place for the examination of candidates. Further, it was his duty to notify all teachers of their appointments. He was directed, also, to maintain office hours each day for performing such official duties as might fall upon him. Security in the amount of five thousand dollars was required as a guarantee for faithful performance of duties and he was permitted to receive such compensation as might be allowed him by the board.

Treasurer.--The treasurer of the board was obliged to receive and keep the moneys of the corporation, and to pay out the same only upon warrants drawn by the president and countersigned by the secretary. A book was required for the purpose of keeping a correct and comprehensive account of all moneys received and disbursed by him, the book to be open for inspection by any member of the board. The secretary was to be furnished with an account monthly, or as desired by him. For the faithful performance of his duties, he was required to furnish security in the amount of thirty thousand dollars. No provision was made by the board for compensation to the treasurer for his services. In 1879 the offices of secretary and treasurer were combined, and Mr. Milton Wash, the secretary, thus became also the treasurer.[1]

Attorney.--The attorney was designated as the legal officer of the board. As such, it was his duty to take charge of all legal business, to make a report to the board semiannually, to attend the meetings of the board and to give his opinion on all legal questions referred to him with opinions in writing when required, to draw all legal instruments and conveyances of the board, and to pay over to the treasurer of the board, receiving receipts therefor, any moneys collected as attorney of record in all suits and proceedings at law. He was allowed such compensation as determined by the board and required to furnish security in the amount of five thousand dollars for the faithful discharge

---

[1] Official Proceedings, Board of Public Schools, St. Louis, III (June 12, 1879), 230.

of his duties.[1]

Superintendent.--The superintendent was directed to devote himself exclusively to the duties of his office. These duties were listed as follows:

> Sec. 22. He shall exercise a general supervision over the Public Schools of the city, and to this end shall visit them as often as practicable, examine into their condition and progress, and see that all the rules prescribed for their government are faithfully observed.
>
> Sec. 23. It shall be his duty, at the close of every quarter, to examine the most advanced pupils in the Primary Departments, and transfer them, if found qualified, to the grammar schools.
>
> Sec. 24. He shall keep himself acquainted with the progress of instruction and discipline in schools in other places, that he may be able to suggest appropriate means for the advancement of the Public Schools in this city.
>
> Sec. 25. He shall report in writing, at the end of every quarter, or whenever required by the Board, giving a detailed statement of the condition and prospects of the Schools, and recommending such measures for their improvement as he may deem advisable. He shall make an annual report as soon as possible after the close of the scholastic year.
>
> Sec. 26. Whenever steps are to be taken to build or alter school houses, he shall communicate to the Building Committee such information on the subject as he may possess, and shall suggest such plans for the same as he may consider best for the health and convenience of the teachers and pupils, and most economical for the Board.
>
> Sec. 27. He shall make investigation as to the number and the condition of the children in the city who are not receiving the benefits of education, and shall endeavor to ascertain the reasons, and to suggest and apply the remedies.
>
> Sec. 28. He shall attend all meetings of the Board, and when requested, those of the Standing Committees.
>
> Sec. 29. He shall be present at the office of the Board every day between the hours of twelve and one o'clock, to attend to such office business as pertains to his department.
>
> Sec. 30. It shall be his duty to assist the Teachers' Committee in the examination of all applicants for situations as teachers, and to keep a record of such examinations.
>
> Sec. 31. It shall be his duty to attend all examinations of the schools, and assist in the same, concurrently with the committees and teachers, under whose direction they take place.
>
> Sec. 32. He shall not allow the school houses to be used for any other purpose than the accommodation of the Public Schools. Whenever the buildings need any repairs, he shall give notice to the Building Committee, and request their immediate attention to the same.
>
> Sec. 33. He shall see that all the necessary School Registers, books of Record, and blanks for Quarterly and

---

[1] Fifth Annual Report of the President, Superintendent and Secretary to the Board of St. Louis Public Schools, 1859, pp. xix-xxiii.

> Annual Reports of teachers are prepared, and ready to be furnished when needed.
>
> Sec. 34. He shall attend to all other duties pertaining to his office which may be required of him by resolution of the Board.
>
> Sec. 35. The Superintendent shall be ex-officio Librarian, and in this capacity he shall have charge of all the books and documents now belonging to the Library, or which may hereafter be added to it by purchase or donation. He shall keep in a book provided for that purpose, a title-list of all the books of the Library, designating those which are purchased, and the prices of the same, and those which are donated, and the names of the donors.
>
> Sec. 36. He shall receive for his services such compensation as may be allowed by the Board.[1]

Bailiff.--To the bailiff was assigned the duty of protecting the real estate held by the board from any trespass, wrong, or injury. He was to prevent any person from taking illegal possession of the real estate, to report any person in adverse possession of such and to order them away from the same. The various janitors were also under his direction as was the supervision of the repair of all schoolhouses. It was his duty to report any dereliction of such duties as were discovered by him. Business matters, other than those assigned other officers, were to be handled by him and he was to collect all bills placed in his hands by the secretary, reporting all delinquents at the regular meetings. All moneys and bills collected by him were to be paid to the treasurer of the board as soon as practicable after receiving the same. However, Section 38 of the rules of the board stated that:

> No act, contract, transaction, or proceeding of said Bailiff, except his receipt for rent, shall bind the Board, or injure or prejudice any right, title, or interest, of, in, or to any property held by the Board.[2]

The bailiff was required to furnish security acceptable to the board in the amount of five thousand dollars as guarantee of his faithful discharge of duties and was to receive such compensation as the board might allow.[3] By action of the board, the office of bailiff was discontinued with the school year ending in 1893. The secretary was authorized and instructed to carry on the work falling to the duty of that office and was authorized an

---

[1] Ibid., pp. xxiii-xxv. [2] Ibid., p. xxv. [3] Ibid.

additional clerk for the purpose of carrying on the work.[1]

Architect.--In addition to the officers provided by the act of 1833 and those created by the board and previously described, the board established the position of architect shortly after 1870, and established rules to govern his performance. It became the stated duty of the architect to draft plans, specifications, and contracts for all buildings and improvements ordered by the board and to furnish the chairman of the building committee copies of such plans, specifications, and contracts in each case. He was instructed to superintend the construction and improvement of all buildings from their inception to their final completion as ordered by the board. He was required to furnish bond in the amount of ten thousand dollars and was allowed compensation in the amount of 3.5 per cent upon the aggregate cost of the completion of buildings and improvements for which he had drawn plans, specifications, and contracts, and which were begun and completed under his supervision.[2]

By 1881 the president of the board expressed some dissatisfaction with the board's system of employing an architect who spent some of his time pursuing his profession on the outside. He believed that the supervision of the janitors and of repairs of the schoolhouses could be more efficiently and economically performed by a practical builder and mechanic who would devote his entire time to the work. This would relieve the school director from performing work for which he had not been trained and place the responsibility upon a competent official who would be expected to keep informed at all times concerning the condition of school property.[3]

This proposal was adopted, and the new office of superintendent of construction and repair was created. The office required a competent builder who would devote his entire time to the board. Due to the large amount of construction going on at the time, the office of architect was temporarily continued until the

---

[1]Fortieth Annual Report of the Board of President and Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, 1894, p. 17.

[2]Eighteenth Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, 1872, pp. xlii-xliii.

[3]Twenty-seventh Annual Report of the Board of President and Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, 1881, p. 26.

expiration of the term of the incumbent in January, 1889.[1]

The work of this officer was scrutinized by the examining committee in 1892. The books were examined and found to be in good order. The books adopted by the superintendent of construction and repairs and examined by the committee were: (1) an order book in which requests by principals for repairs were noted in order of receipt; (2) an order book, with stubs, for obtaining supplies from dealers; (3) a book designed to contain a record of all work let by the building committee not including, however, the work of the new board of education building or the new high-school building; (4) a book showing accounts of employees of the board in the repair departments; (5) a book concerning the removal of ashes; (6) a book containing a list of all vouchers approved by the building committee, properly referenced; and (7) a contract book intended for recording of all contracts for new buildings and repair of old buildings.[2]

Fiscal officers.--Two other officers created by the board of education were the supply agent and the auditor. The supply agent became an officer of the board for the first time in 1878.[3] In addition to being secretary of the committee on supplies, it was his duty to take charge of the supplies and textbooks, furniture, and all other personal property of the board and to attend to the distribution of the same. He was charged with the responsibility of making all purchases required upon proper requisition and approved by the proper committee. In managing supplies he was instructed to keep two accounts: (1) supplies, textbooks, and apparatus for the general use of schools, and (2) textbooks and other materials sold to the patrons of the schools. In addition, he kept an accurate account of all supplies furnished to each school and made reports to the board concerning the same. Under rules of the board he became the purchasing agent and was required to keep inventories of all furniture, effects, and supplies. As a guarantee of faithful performance of his duties, a

---

[1] Thirty-fourth Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, 1888, pp. 16-17.

[2] Thirty-eighth Annual Report of the Board of President and Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, 1892, p. cix.

[3] Twenty-eighth Annual Report of the Board of President and Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, 1882, pp. 25-26.

bond of five thousand dollars was established.[1]

The board appointed an auditor in 1890 to modernize the board's system of keeping accounts.[2] The duties of the auditor will be listed under the discussion of the board's organization pursuant to the revision of the charter in 1897.

In addition to the rules set forth for the various officers of the board, they adopted rules pertaining to their attendance at meetings and the manner in which the board would operate at its meetings in considering the business of the board.[3]

Committees.--The rules of the board provided that the president should appoint the eleven standing committees at the second regular meeting in July. These committees were auditing committee, teachers' committee, committee on lands and claims, leasing committee, high-school committee, committee on books and apparatus, building committee, library committee, committee on evening schools, committee on ways and means, and committee on salaries. The members of the teachers', lands and claims, leasing, and building committees consisted of one member from each of the five districts established, while all others consisted of three members each.

It was the duty of the auditing committee to examine monthly or oftener every bill or claim presented to the board for payment. The treasurer's and secretary's books were subject to their revision quarterly, or oftener if required, and no bill paid without the approval of this committee. Contracts regularly made by the board and teachers' salaries could be paid upon coming due. Bills amounting to ten dollars or less could be paid out of the contingent fund without specific approval.

The supervision of the normal school was a specific duty of the teachers' committee. In this connection the school was to be visited as often as possible by members and a report made quarterly concerning condition and prospects of the school. In conjunction with the superintendent, it was the responsibility of this committee to examine applicants for situations and to keep a record in a book of their respective qualifications. The committee

---

[1] Ibid., Appendix, pp. 25-26.

[2] Thirty-sixth Annual Report of the Board of President and Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, 1890, p. xcviii.

[3] Ibid., p. xxx.

was empowered to examine teachers and grant certificates to those considered qualified. However, certification did not necessarily entitle the holder to employment by the board. In co-operation with the superintendent, it was their duty to make nominations to fill vacancies occurring, subject to review by the board. Temporary appointments could be made and teachers transferred from one school to another, but such appointments had to be reported to the board at its next meeting for final decision.

To the committee on lands and claims was assigned the responsibility of considering and reporting on all claims to real estate in which the board was interested or upon any such claims as might be referred to the committee.

The leasing committee was assigned the general supervision over all lands belonging to the board and all matters concerning the leasing of property referred to them. Each year, during the month of March or oftener as required, the committee was directed to place a minimum value upon all unleased land in actual possession of the board and to file a list of such in the office of the secretary.

The duty of supervision of the high school, in conjunction with the superintendent, was allotted to the high-school committee. Textbooks were selected by them subject to the sanction of the board. Visitations were to be made to the high-school as often as possible with quarterly reports to the board with suggestions for possible improvements. The examinations for high-school teachers were conducted under such regulations as the high-school committee might prescribe.

Subject to the sanction of the board, the committee on books and apparatus had general direction of the textbooks to be used in the public schools. Before any book could be presented by an author for adoption, it was necessary to submit copies of the book to each member of the board and one to the library. Each such application had to be studied carefully by the committee and a report made by them with reasons setting forth their recommendations for or against such adoption.

It was the duty of the building committee at the time of appointment to take charge of all buildings and, whenever any new building was wanted, to suggest the best plans and methods for its construction. The committee had charge of all buildings during their construction for the purpose of studying the most economical

and commodious changes necessary for the comfort and welfare of the schools under their jurisdiction. During the months of July and December the committee was required to examine into the state of each building for the purpose of reporting what painting, repairs, or alterations were needed and to furnish an estimate concerning the same. No repairs exceeding the cost of ten dollars could be effected without the sanction of the committee and the approval of the board.

General supervision of the library was assigned to the library committee. It was their duty to recommend any additions considered necessary and to make any such rules considered expedient in the functioning of the library.

The committee on evening schools was directed to visit all evening schools established by the board and to report monthly to the board concerning the registration of pupils, character of attendance, and other information concerning the condition and usefulness of the schools. Their duties, in conjunction with the superintendent, included making necessary arrangements in relation to the formation, extension, and welfare of the schools as well as selecting the teachers and fixing their salaries subject to board approval.

The ways and means committee was required to examine into the income derived from the property of the public schools and that obtained from other sources. They ascertained what expenses were necessary in the operation of the schools and the amount of funds available for any proposed object. Reports concerning these matters were required by the board.

With the exception of the salaries of teachers in the evening schools, the committee on salaries considered and reported upon all matters relating to salaries of officers, teachers, and janitors which were referred to them.[1]

A large share of the work of the board was done in the committees appointed by the president. By 1875 there were twelve standing committees of the board. At that time the board consisted of twenty-six members, each of the thirteen wards within the city being entitled to two members.[2] By 1879 these committees

---

[1] Ibid., pp. xxvi-xxx.

[2] Twenty-first Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, 1875, pp. 5-6.

were so composed as to represent all sections of the city, each district of four wards was entitled to one member on each of the committees. These committees consisting of eight members, the president serving as member ex officio. They held frequent meetings and made reports to the board at subsequent meetings. In addition to the larger committees, smaller ones were appointed from time to time as conditions warranted.[1] It is a matter of record that Superintendent Harris approved this type of committee work. Committees from the board worked with him in considering problems arising in connection with the course of study, examinations, and promotions.[2]

Harris favored large committees representing all sections of the city. He felt that when school boards formed local committees without city-wide representation they tended to devote their attention to matters of certain localities thereby securing favoritism to the locality with consequent detriment to other sections of the city. The larger committees, in his opinion, were better able to withstand local pressure and thus could eliminate inequalities which would be created by smaller partisan committees.[3]

Activities of Early Boards of Education

It is significant that, from the beginning, matters of education were not left to any branch of the city government. At the time of its incorporation in 1833, the city consisted of three wards and, according to provisions, two members were elected from each ward. The membership of the board, therefore, consisted of six members. By 1859 the number of wards had increased to ten, and the board's membership, therefore, totaled twenty. Members were elected for a term of three years and their election arranged so that one-third of the members went out of office each year. The board was invested with full and absolute power to hold and control all lands and property granted for school purposes within

---

[1] Twenty-fifth Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, 1879, p. 254.

[2] Official Proceedings, op. cit., I (March 19, 1872), 146.

[3] Ibid., III (June 12, 1879), 260.

the city of St. Louis, to establish schools, manage the same, expend the revenues, and generally do all lawful acts which were necessary to carry into effect the object of the corporation.[1]

Management of school lands.--Much of the work of the first boards concerned their activities in gaining control of and managing such lands as the board owned. There is some evidence to support the contention that many of the members sought service on the board for matters of personal gain. Before the legislature imposed certain restrictions concerning the board's membership, it often happened that members were elected to the board who were interested in claims under which speculators had seized upon the school's lands. Claimants took a more active part in electing board members than did the public. Some of the claimants would move into wards where members were to be elected and threatened for a time to gain control of the board. The legislature was petitioned in regard to these evils and restrictive measures adopted to control the difficulty.[2]

Establishment of schools.--On November 29, 1834, a committee was appointed to prepare a plan for a public schoolhouse. A report was made concerning this on December 8 without any action being taken upon it. On May 7, 1836, Messrs. Campbell, Hoffman, and Finney were appointed a committee to confer with the board of aldermen on the subject of erection of schoolhouses in the city. What the board of aldermen had to do with the matter is not stated, but it is assumed that it had reference to the amount of money which the board would realize from the sale of the commons. No record was kept of this committee's actions. On December 3, 1836, Mr. McLaughlin for the "committee" reported that certain lots had been selected for the erection of schoolhouses.

On July 18, 1837, it was reported that the lots selected were too small for the erection of schools as decided by earlier plans. It was recommended that two-story buildings be erected instead of one-story and the plan was agreed to. Contractors were secured for effecting the construction of the buildings at no more than three thousand five hundred dollars each. On December 3, 1837, the board ordered the purchase of "four outline maps of the world" for the schools about to be opened and adopted rules and

---

[1] Fifth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 18.

[2] First Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 49-50.

regulations for government of the schools. At the same meeting a resolution was passed to notify the public through the public prints that the board would receive applications from teachers.[1]

Delegation of responsibility.--The board convened in conforming to the resolution passed in December, 1837, for the purpose of interviewing applicants for teaching positions. At that meeting, ten male and two female candidates appeared. The board of directors appointed a board of school inspectors, consisting of eight persons. All of these individuals were outside the membership of the board of directors and were given power to examine and appoint all teachers by and with the concurrence of the directors. The inspectors were also authorized to fix tuition fees with the provision, however, that those unable to pay were to be admitted free. The report of the board of inspectors submitted on February 24, 1838, was referred back to them with the request that the merits of each applicant be outlined, and when their subsequent report was made on March 3, 1838, the board of directors proceeded to elect two teachers. Miss Mary H. Salisbury and David Armstrong received the majority of the votes of the board.[2]

With the construction of additional schools and employment of additional teachers, salaries were lowered with the effect that it became impossible to secure a sufficient number of satisfactory teachers. In view of this serious condition, the board of directors in 1848 appointed an agent to proceed to eastern cities to hire the required number of professional teachers. This agent was selected by the president and the secretary. In August, this agent returned from the east bringing with him fifteen teachers.[3]

Interest in instruction.--The first board of directors in St. Louis was concerned mainly with the management of school properties, introduction of improved modes in the internal arrangement of schoolhouses, construction of their furniture, adoption of the best textbooks, modes of grading and classifying schools, and the employment of teachers.[4] It has been shown that the board of directors delegated some of its responsibilities in the actual selec-

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 50-52. [2] Ibid., pp. 52-53.

[3] Ibid., p. 54. [4] Fifth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 13.

tion of teachers. Also, there is evidence to support the contention that matters of instruction were of little concern to the board. In commenting upon this, Superintendent Tice stated that,

> It was a fortunate circumstance to popular education in St. Louis that there was neither a Board of Directors, nor any officer charged with the supervision of the schools, who, with "malice prepense," attempted to give St. Louis an educational system.[1]

This work was left very largely to the teachers who were considered by Superintendent Tice to be doing very good work. In commenting upon this he stated that, of the seventy-two teachers in the employ of the board, many needed no supervision whatever while others did need either general or specific supervision. He felt that a five-minute visit to each of the rooms was insufficient time to form correct opinions of a teacher's worth and believed that some plan should be adopted where supervision could be regularized. He advocated that the board adopt a regulation which would make it the duty of the superintendent to pass in review, at least once each quarter, or oftener if possible, all classes under the charge of principals or assistants, to ascertain progress made and to determine whether there had been proper mental discipline and training. The adoption of such a rule would make no discrimination between situations or persons and would not lay the superintenient open to suspicion or favoritism. Without such a rule any such action as suggested was considered by Tice to be out of the question.[2]

The board did take some interest in the progress of scholars as indicated by the fact that certain examinations were attended by a committee of the board as well as by an invited committee of citizens. From these visits the board commented upon the state of "thorough discipline and efficient instruction."[3] The interest of the board in "discipline" was manifested very early. The report for the year 1861-62 carried the statement that the board would award a higher degree of appreciation and preference in promotions to those teachers who proved most successful in controlling their pupils without the use of corporal punishment,

---

[1] First Annual Report, op. cit., p. 2. [2] Ibid., pp. 21-23.

[3] Sixth Annual Report of the Superintendent and Secretary to the Board of St. Louis Public Schools, 1860, p. 64.

other qualifications being sufficient.[1]

Rise of Superintendency

The work and influence of the first superintendents in the St. Louis public schools have not been made a matter of record. From information listed in the First Annual Report, the first superintendent was George K. Budd who had been appointed as a member of the board of school inspectors. Prior to the issuance of the First Annual Report, the following are indicated as having served as superintendents with salaries shown.

George K. Budd, 1839; salary, "thanks."
Henry Pearson, superintendent and secretary, 1841 to 1842; salary, $300.
Edward M. Avery, superintendent and secretary, 1848 to 1849; salary, $900.
Spencer Smith, superintendent and secretary, 1850 to 1851; salary, $1,000.
J. H. Tice, superintendent pro tempore and secretary, 1851 to 1852; salary, $1,500.
A. Litton, superintendent, 1852-1853; salary, $1,500.
Charles A. Putnam, superintendent, 1853 (died); salary, $1,500.
J. H. Tice, superintendent and secretary, 1854; salary, $1,500.[2]

Superintendent Tice, in his First Annual Report, characterized his predecessor, Charles A. Putnam who died in 1853, as follows: "In him the Board has lost an active, faithful, and conscientious officer, the schools an enlightened and sincere friend, the community a worthy man, and the church a devoted, exemplary Christian."[3]

A careful study of the First Annual Report for the public schools of St. Louis reveals that the schools were fortunate in having a superintendent with the breadth of vision indicated in the writings of Tice. In his report he discusses such subjects as the following: the teaching of arithmetic, grammar, reading and rhetoric, punctuation, geography, writing, vocal music, and other studies. He urged the establishment of a department of normal instruction and the raising of qualifications of teachers

---

[1] Seventh and Eighth Annual Reports of the Superintendent and Secretary to the Board of St. Louis Public Schools, 1860-61 and 1861-62, p. xviii.

[2] First Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 98-99.

[3] Ibid., p. 2.

and saw the wisdom of developing a plan for school supervision.[1]

His First Annual Report was closed with the following paragraph.

> However gratifying present attainments are, we must not rest content, but press onward and upward, for there is a greater good beyond which is attainable; but which can only be attained by consistent and enlightened measures, and harmonious and earnest endeavors. Let each of us take for his motto, "The free education of all, the present glory and future hope of our city and country," and with singleness of purpose, relying upon the justice of our cause, and with the blessing of Providence, enter upon the discharge of our high trust, as the guardians and protectors of the present and future generations of this mighty city.[2]

In his Second Annual Report, Superintendent Tice devoted considerable space to a discussion of the "Superintendency." He stated that whereas ten years previous there had not been a city superintendent in the Union, all large cities with the exception of Philadelphia and Baltimore had established the position. He expressed a very strong feeling that the superintendency should be a real and not a nominal position. In his opinion the superintendent should be required to keep himself constantly informed of the school systems both within this country as well as outside. Such knowledge should consist of their organization, modes of government, improvements in schoolhouse architecture, furniture, ventilation, means of warming, apparatus, best methods of instruction generally, most effective modes of teaching each particular branch, and the progress made in moral and intellectual education everywhere.[3]

With respect to the authority of the superintendent, Tice stated:

> The Superintendent, therefore, ought to have advisory power in all matters relating to the schools, and be required to examine into and report upon every proposition of improvement. He ought to be required to make himself familiar with the mode of government and system of instruction pursued by each teacher, and have authority to direct such change as may be deemed necessary by him to secure greater efficiency. He ought to be required to give especial attention, and even render every assistance to those of little experience in teaching, and be able and authorized to aid, advise and stimulate

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 6-24.

[2] Ibid., p. 84.

[3] Second Annual Report of the Superintendent of the St. Louis Public Schools, 1855, p. 82.

> all connected with the school administration, in the performance of their office and duties. He should, in fact, be the executive officer of the school system, and see that all the laws, rules, and regulations of the Board are uniformly, truly, and faithfully observed and executed in all the departments of the schools. Some of the duties above enumerated are now made the duties of the Superintendent, but a more specific definition of his duties and powers is required to give proper efficiency to that officer.[1]

Ira Divoll became superintendent in 1857 and from the first day of his appointment, "devoted himself exclusively to the duties of his office" as recommended by his predecessor, Tice. In preparation for his position, he visited the schools of Philadelphia, New York, and other eastern cities for the purpose of obtaining all possible information as to the most approved plans of constructing schoolhouses, the best methods of organization and classification for schools, the different systems of discipline and instruction, and the best methods of keeping school registers.[2]

During the school term, Superintendent Divoll reported that he had spent nearly six hours each school day in visiting schools and in out-of-school hours attended to such matters as correspondence, meeting with committees, examining applicants for teachers' situations, arranging cases of discipline, and making of reports. During the course of the year he made over seven hundred visits to the different schools, and fully twice that number to various classrooms. During these visits he carefully examined all the departments and classes in the branches allotted to each, acquainted himself with the methods of discipline and instruction pursued by each teacher, and rendered assistance and advice where the circumstances seemed to require such.[3]

Growth of Superintendent's Influence

The president of the board, reporting for the year ending in 1868, realized the importance of placing the direction of the schools under the guidance of the superintendent. He made the following statement regarding this matter:

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Fourth Annual Report of the President, Superintendent and Secretary to the Board of St. Louis Public Schools, 1858, p. 9.

[3] Ibid., pp. 9-10.

> In bringing my remarks to a conclusion, I would allude to the arduous labors of the Board. The office of Director is not easily filled by one who endeavors to perform conscientiously the obvious duties devolving on him. The ever increasing care of the management of our real estate--its proper improvement, the just appraisement of the portions leased, the protection of the same from trespass, or opposing claimants, the settlement of compromises--all these duties, added to the care of providing for the purchase of proper building lots and the erection of new school buildings in the proper localities, involving again a multitude of perplexing details in the selection of the best for buildings, the proper apparatus for heating and ventilation, a careful supervision of every item in the building, in order to prevent frauds in the quality, quantity, or prices charged--and still we have not enumerated the most obvious duty of the School Director. He is expected first of all to make himself acquainted with the practical working of the schools; with the methods of discipline and instruction there pursued; the qualification of the teachers and the results they produce from year to year. But I may truly say, without casting reflection upon any member of the Board, that these latter duties are seldom performed. The labors of the former kind are so engrossing and imperative that the latter are necessarily left to the Superintendents more than is the case in other cities. The result is that greater responsibility is thrown upon those officers and more is expected from the principals of the schools than is done elsewhere. This state of affairs, it is probable, will remain until the rising generation furnishes a class of men who, while well educated, have plenty of leisure to give most of their time to the schools. Such, indeed, is the case in the older cities of this country. But for the present, our course is plain: we must use all vigilance in procuring the best talent for teachers--and particularly for principals--of our schools, and thus make sure in advance that proper direction of the public instruction which the community justly demands at our hands.[1]

This matter was again discussed in the president's next report, at which time he urged an increase in the superintendent's assistants in order that more close supervision could be exercised. He further stated that the admixture of general business duties at the office of the board with the special duties of looking after educational methods in the schools tended to dissipate the strength of the supervising officer.[2]

The importance of the office of superintendent was enhanced by William T. Harris, who succeeded Divoll as superintendent in 1867. His work and influence constitute an important phase in the

---

[1] Fourteenth Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, 1868, p. 11.

[2] Fifteenth Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, 1869, p. 10.

development of school administration in the city of St. Louis. He had served as assistant superintendent to Divoll. During this period he had devoted himself to the improvement of methods in the various subjects taught in the schools and the general improvement of the course of study.[1] Upon his selection as superintendent he continued his interest in this aspect of the schools. However, the duties of his office infringed upon duties which he considered fundamental to the superintendent. Most of these duties he considered extraordinary in character and requiring immediate attention. He considered it necessary to keep his office open all day for consultation and classified the persons who called upon the superintendent as follows: (1) parents desiring to enter their children in schools and wanting information about the methods to accomplish entrance; (2) parents desiring to transfer pupils from one school to another or wishing to enter complaints against teachers or attempting to obtain restoration for some pupil suspended from school; (3) visitors in the city wishing to inspect the school system; (4) board members desiring some item of information or correction of some abuse discovered; (5) teachers desiring information or assistance or making some irregular request.

In addition to conferring with such individuals, it was necessary to keep up with the preparation of quarterly reports and fill vacancies occurring daily on account of sickness in the corps of teachers. Superintendent Harris felt that the time left should be spent vigorously in the visitation of schools.[2] However, it was his opinion that such supervision as the superintendent could give should be for the purpose of detecting general tendencies in methods and comparing them one with another for the purpose of discussing them with assistants. He did not feel it to be the duty of the superintendent, whose duties were general, to correct individual cases of bad methods in teaching or discipline. Such matters as that could be left to the principals and assistants.[3]

At the same time, he set about to educate his boards in the various aspects of school administration. His discussions

---

[1] Thirteenth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 56.

[2] Fifteenth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 132-33.

[3] Twenty-second Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, 1876, p. 195.

contained in the various reports constitute important contributions to the field of educational literature. Among the subjects presented for consideration of the board were: relation of the public schools to the community and the state; moral education and the relation of education to crime; the coeducation of the sexes; introduction of natural science into the district schools; proper selection of plans for schoolhouses; various matters relating to the course of study; significance of the elementary branches in district schools; the Pestalozzian system and the methods in common use in this country; the objects of German-English instruction and the best methods of managing the same; supervision of schools by principals; and the grading of schools.[1] In addition, Harris found time to visit the schools of New York City, Oswego, Boston, Cleveland, Cincinnati, Indianapolis, and Chicago. He reported to the board relative to his findings in these cities.[2]

In addition to his interest in the academic aspect of the schools, he took an active part in the business and financial affairs of the schools. In this connection, salary schedules were set up for the system which paid moderate wages to new and inexperienced teachers and greater sums to those of greater experience and responsibilities.[3] He sought to combat fluctuating policies in connection with school affairs and advocated that boards not become unreasonable in retrenchment at times of financial stress. He believed that it was the duty of teachers and school boards to prevent too great reactions in either direction thus preventing the "Bulls and Bears in Education" from holding too great a sway in public education.[4]

In spite of the great advances made in the matter of professionalizing the place of the superintendent, it is of interest that Harris never was made anything more than superintendent of instruction. In spite of his work with the various board committees and other officers of the board, he was never made its execu-

---

[1] Eighteenth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 13.

[2] Ibid., p. 157.

[3] Twenty-first Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 34-35.

[4] Twenty-fourth Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, 1878, p. 204.

tive officer in name. He was, by virtue of the law, a superintendent of instruction.

Appointment of Examining Committee

By 1879 the schools within the city had grown to such an extent and the business of the board had reached such proportions that it was proposed to establish a committee to examine into the accounts of the secretary, treasurer, and bailiff of the board. The proposition as adopted by the board called for the appointment of two members of the board and three citizens outside of board membership. The committee was also given power to employ a competent clerk at the expense of the board.[1] A resolution adopted on August 12 following the creation of this committee authorized it to extend its examination to include the general fiscal affairs of the board.[2]

The examining committee created June 12, 1879, made its report on February 17, 1880. At that time it found the fiscal affairs of the board to be in a confused state and recommended that the office of auditor be created to assist in keeping the financial affairs of the board in order. It also indicated needed revisions in the handling of the permanent fund and in the management of supplies as well as other minor matters.[3] The president of the board reporting the following year stated that the work of the examining committee had been done in such a thoroughly conscientious fashion that it should be the policy to have such examinations annually instead of at irregular intervals.[4] Following this recommendation, the board approved on May 13, 1884, of a committee of three to be appointed each year to serve as an examining committee.[5]

The work of the examining committees became so influential that, largely as a result of their recommendations, the board created the office of auditor and that of assistant superintendent of construction and repairs. Through these officers the board

---

[1] Official Proceedings, op. cit., III (June 12, 1879), 260.

[2] Ibid., p. 393. [3] Ibid., pp. 394-405.

[4] Twenty-seventh Annual Report, op. cit., p. 24.

[5] Official Proceedings, op. cit., V (May 13, 1884), 157.

sought thoroughly to systematize the financial and building departments.[1] Thus began the movement to remove much of the direction of these departments from the committees to special officers.

Change in Board Membership

For the year 1887 the board membership, on the basis of ward representation, had grown to twenty-eight members. By an act approved by the legislature on March 30, 1887, it became necessary to conduct a special election for board members on a somewhat different basis. The city of St. Louis, having over 300,000 population, was to be divided into fourteen districts with one member elected from each district and seven members elected at large.[2] The election was hotly contested and certain basic issues were considered. The policies which the winning side supported were: (1) state and national politics should have nothing to do with the management of the public schools; (2) in spite of scarcity of funds and without increasing the tax-rate, additional buildings and teachers should be provided to accommodate all children of school age; (3) rigid economy should be practiced in all building construction, and (4) no language but the English language should be taught at public expense in the primary and district schools. The board began immediate retrenchments along these lines.[3]

The board proceeded on May 8, 1888, with the adoption of rules to govern the new body. These rules were not essentially different from those reported earlier with certain exceptions and additions. Among these changes were: (1) The paid officers of the board were to be elected only every three years. (2) The offices of treasurer and secretary could be filled by the same person. (3) The examining committee was made up of three members, one from the board and two accountants who were citizens of St. Louis. (4) The superintendent was required to visit each school at least every six months, and provision was made for his assistants. In addition to rules for officers designated in previous rules, new rules were provided for the architect, superintendent

---

[1] Thirty-seventh Annual Report of the Board of President and Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, 1891, p. 9.

[2] Official Proceedings, op. cit., VI (April 12, 1887), 130-31.

[3] Thirty-fourth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 9-10.

of construction and repairs, and the supply agent.

The revised rules also provided for ten committees as follows: auditing committee, consisting of three members; teachers committee, consisting of seven members; lands and leasing committee, consisting of five members; supplies committee consisting of five members; course of study committee, consisting of five members; building committee, consisting of seven members; ways and means committee, consisting of five members; salary committee, consisting of three members; library committee, consisting of seven members; and rules committee, consisting of three members.[1]

Politics within the Board

The early boards of St. Louis were praised for their integrity and lack of partisan politics. Much credit was taken by the board for their position in keeping the schools free from politics and sectarianism. Officers within the board were cited as being chosen purely on merit.[2] The fact that the system did contain opportunity for the existence of partisan politics was recognized by Superintendent Harris when he said,

> The fact that the members of the Board are elected by the people directly would seem to furnish occasion for the introduction of partisan politics into the management of the schools, but the history of the system proves otherwise, and whether this is accidental or not, St. Louis has been very fortunate in keeping her school interests distinct from the exciting arena of politics.[3]

Later boards do not appear to have been so conscientious in their duties. The examining committee reporting for the year 1881 reported that while the board had adopted a good system of business management, its satisfactory operation was contingent upon the convenience or caprice of the board and its committees; and that while good rules might be adopted, there was danger in disregarding them as had been done in the past.[4] The report for

---

[1] Official Proceedings, op. cit., VI (May 8, 1888), 395-467.

[2] Nineteenth Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, 1873, pp. 11-12.

[3] Fourteenth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 102.

[4] Twenty-seventh Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 124-25.

the year 1888 carried the statement that, when board members were elected from each ward, it seemed to have been considered a "prerequisite" to have the privilege of appointing the janitors in a given ward, and that such a prerogative might in the future be considered the province of a committee. It urged the adoption of a merit system rather than the spoils system.[1] The situation was described by Mr. Edward C. Eliot, a former member of the St. Louis board as follows:

> For some years prior to 1897 the school affairs of St. Louis were notoriously corrupt, and in the hands of a ring of contractors and designing politicians. In that year the Legislature adopted a new charter or law governing the Board of Education.[2]

Organization of Board Pursuant to School Law of 1897

The new law, referred to generally as the Civic Federation Bill, was passed by the Missouri legislature on March 23, 1897. The corporation known as the "Board of President and Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools" was succeeded by the creation of a "Board of Education of the City of St. Louis." The law has been fully described in Chapter II.

A special election took place sixty days after the bill became a law and at once invested all title in and control over school property in the city of St. Louis in the new board of education as the legal successor to the old corporation and simultaneously ended the service of the school board which had heretofore been in office. The fiscal year remained unchanged and the new law also retained the provision for an annual report at the end of each year.[3]

The supervision, gover[illegible], and administration of the schools were vested in a board [illegible]f twelve members, chosen at a general election from the city at large, in a superintendent of instruction, a commissioner of school buildings, a secretary-

---

[1] Thirty-fourth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 26.

[2] Edward C. Eliot, "School Administration: The St. Louis Method," Educational Review, XXVI (December, 1903), 464-65.

[3] Forty-third Annual Report of the Board of Education of the St. Louis Public Schools, 1897, p. 11.

treasurer, an auditor, and a commissioner of supplies.[1] The board of twelve members was considered sufficiently large to insure deliberation and caution without being unwieldly. The fact that they were chosen at large corrected one of the worst evils of the former charter. With shifting populations in large cities only an election-at-large can freely determine the will of the people. In addition, every member was required by law to take an oath to the effect that he would not, during his term of office, be influenced by any consideration except that of merit and fitness in the appointment of officers and engagement of employees. By general consent, membership on the board was divided equally between the two political parties.[2]

The administrative and executive duties formerly reserved for the committees of the board of public schools was placed under the new law with the heads of the departments. By its rules the board of education endowed its committees with supervisory but not with executive and administrative power. The board retained its power to direct, control, and supervise and to be the final source of authority. This tended to reduce the arduous duties of board members since much of the business formerly transacted in and by committees and by individual members was now to be handled by officers appointed for that purpose. The board delegated to the heads of departments sufficient power to conduct the public business without delay, but prescribed to them the course to be pursued and demanded formal reports of all business transacted and submission of every new measure for approval or rejection. Thus it became necessary to choose officers because of their special qualifications to carry on the work of the board.

This delegation of power not only placed the greater part of the current work in the hands of paid, professionally trained officials but had the effect of localizing and fixing responsibility. This was antithetical to the former plans where committees of five or seven possessed discretionary and executive power, and where there was no fixed individual or personal responsibility for any action taken. The responsibility of the committee, under the former arrangement, was always divided. Under the new plan

---

[1] Laws of Missouri, 1897, pp. 221-22.

[2] Eliot, op. cit., pp. 466-67.

every step of the executive officers would be scrutinized by a board placed over them.[1]

The business of the schools was divided among four departments, each supervised by an officer appointed by the board. These officers were designated as superintendent of instruction, commissioner of school buildings, secretary-treasurer, and auditor. The law defined their qualifications. Their terms of office were fixed, and they could be removed by the board only upon a two-thirds vote and for cause. Upon their appointment they became to a great extent independent of the board and directly responsible to the public. Even though the board had the power to make rules concerning the conduct of the officers, these rules were voided if they conflicted with or limited the powers directly entrusted to these officers by the law. The intent of the law was that the officers should have both the power and the responsibility for the practical administration of the schools.[2]

Superintendent of instruction.--The department in direct control of the educational work was placed under the control of the superintendent of instruction. All appointments, promotions, transfers of teachers, and introduction and changes of textbooks and apparatus, according to the law, were to be made only upon his recommendation and subsequent approval of the board. Subject to the control of the board, he was given supervision of the course of instruction, discipline, and conduct of the schools. The board held the power to fix the number and salaries of his clerks, but the power of appointment or removal became solely that of the superintendent.

The only power under the law residing with the board with respect to appointment of teachers was that of confirmation or rejection. The superintendent was given the power to appoint all teachers each year with power to resort to methods of examination, if found desirable. If the superintendent did not choose to make an appointment, the board could do nothing to effect the appointment. During the year the superintendent might suspend a teacher, but it was the province of the board to dismiss her.[3]

Commissioner of school buildings.--The law provided that

---

[1] Forty-fourth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the St. Louis Public Schools, 1898, pp. 140-41.

[2] Ibid., pp. 369-70.

[3] Ibid., pp. 370-71.

the commissioner of school buildings should be charged with the responsibility for the care of public school buildings of the city, with the duty of caring for such matters as ventilation, warming, sanitary conditions, and proper repairs. All specifications for the construction and repair of buildings and consequent superintending of such repair and construction were allotted to him.

Subject to board of education approval as to number and salaries, the commissioner was given power to appoint as many engineers, janitors, and other employees and agents as he considered necessary for the proper performance of the duties of his department. He was also given power to remove them. To the board was given the right to require a system of examinations for appointment if they chose, and it was stipulated that the commissioner of school buildings was bound by any such system imposed.[1]

Fiscal representatives.--The secretary-treasurer and the auditor became the fiscal representatives of the board, the former as a custodian of funds and property, and the latter as accountant. While their independence of the board was not so marked as in the case of the other officers just described, they did not become mere agents of that body. Their duties could not be imposed upon other persons, though it was possible to regulate them. The secretary-treasurer was required to see that no liability was incurred or expenditure made without the proper authority and that appropriations were not overdrawn. According to provisions, the auditor was given the direct duty of auditing only such indebtedness and accounts as were properly incurred. They, therefore, became responsible to the public for the honesty of their administration.[2]

The offices described were definitely provided for through the charter as determined by the law of 1897. The board of education exercised its own prerogative by establishing two other offices to facilitate the work of the board. These officers are the supply commissioner and the attorney. The office of supply agent was created in 1877 because of the tremendous increase in the business of the board and the expansion of the schools. With the establishment of the board under the new charter, this position was replaced by the supply commissioner. He had no powers

---

[1] Ibid., p. 371. [2] Eliot, op. cit., pp. 467-71.

by the charter but derived his powers from rules and regulations adopted by the board in conformity with charter provisions. The rules governing his functions are indicated as follows:

> Section 1. The Supply Commissioner shall have charge of the Supply Department, including the contents of the Board's Depository (Warehouse), except machinery and fixtures permanently affixed to the building, and shall also have charge of all materials in the woodworking, paint, and repair shops, and he shall also receive and distribute all manufactured and repaired articles coming from said shops, and shall conduct the same in accordance with the laws relating to the purchase of supplies and the rules of the Board pertaining to that department.
>
> Section 2. For the faithful discharge of his duties he shall give a bond in the sum of twenty thousand dollars, with sureties to be approved by the Board; and shall be authorized to appoint, subject to the approval of the Board, such clerks, packers, and custodians, at the warehouses or places of storage as may be authorized, to assist in the discharge of his duties during his term of office, at such compensation as may be fixed by the Board.[1]

Attorney.--From the beginning the board had recognized the necessity of legal assistance from men professionally trained in that field. At the time of publishing the First Annual Report, the board had had in its employ only two counselors, one from 1846 to 1853, and the other from 1853 to 1854.[2] As in the case of the commissioner of supplies, the attorney was without charter powers, so operated under rules of the board of education as follows:

> Section 1. It shall be the duty of the Attorney to take charge of the legal business of the Board in all courts of the State and of the United States, and to make a report to the Board semi-annually, on the second Tuesday of April and October, of the state of its business in the courts; and he shall enumerate in such report all undecided claims of the Board, and also report the disposal of such as have been acted upon during the last half year. He shall attend the meetings of the Board and give his written opinion on all legal questions referred to him by the Board or by standing committees, draw all legal instruments, leases, and other conveyances of the Board, and pay all moneys collected by him for the Board to the Secretary and Treasurer of the Board. He shall also be the legal advisor of the officers of the Board touching their official duties. He shall, when necessary, call the attention of the Board to legislation

---

[1] Rules and Regulations of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, pp. 13-14. St. Louis: Board of Education, 1926.

[2] First Annual Report, op. cit., p. 99.

which may be needed in furtherance of its purposes.

Section 2. It shall be the duty of the Attorney to examine the annual report of the Auditor of the records of the State Courts in the City of St. Louis, provided for in Rule 9, Section I, and to make such recommendations to the Board or take such recommendations to the Board or take such action thereon as may be required.

Section 3. Subject to the approval of the Board the Attorney may appoint an Assistant Attorney who shall serve during the pleasure of the Attorney and who shall perform the duties of the Attorney during the latter's absence or inability to act. The Assistant Attorney shall receive no compensation from the Board.[1]

Comptroller.--One other office created, but of short duration, was the office of comptroller. After investigation by a special committee of the board, the rules were changed to permit the functioning of a comptroller. He was to have access to all accounts, inventories, books, and records of the board and its officers. The various departments were to be investigated and all contracts for supplies and materials to be examined. As a result of these investigations, recommendations were to be made concerning the various economies to be effected and improvements suggested.[2] The supply commissioner at that time became the comptroller.[3] After approximately three years, this position was abolished and the rules of the board were revised in accordance with the change.[4]

Committees.--Four standing committees appointed annually by the board were as follows: committee on instruction, committee on school buildings, committee on finance, and committee on auditing and supplies. These committees met monthly one week prior to the regular monthly meeting of the board. Each committee consisted of three members and the president of the board who served as member ex-officio. The rules of the board vested all executive functions in the salaried officers, but each committee was given supervisory power over the department indicated by its name. At the monthly meeting of the committee it examined the report which the chief of its department anticipated presenting to the board. Much of the board's business was, therefore, done at these meetings and the entire board advised through regular re-

---

[1] Rules and Regulations, op. cit., pp. 8-9.

[2] Official Proceedings, op. cit., XLIX (December 8, 1942), 546-47.

[3] Ibid., pp. 585-86. [4] Ibid., LII (September 11, 1945), 223-25.

ports of matters to be presented at the regular meeting.[1]

While much of the board's affairs was transacted in the committees, this did not mean that the board lacked power nor that its influence would not be felt in the direction of policies and the supervision of affairs. The officers in charge were given their independent functions, and their relations to the board were well defined. In other words, they became responsible both to the board and to the public at large.[2]

The work of one other committee is deserving of some mention. It has been pointed out that the board of education in the city of St. Louis has no single executive officer, the business of the board being accomplished through the superintendent of instruction, a secretary-treasurer, a commissioner of school buildings, an auditor, a supply commissioner, and an attorney. The two latter officers are not governed by statutory provisions since these positions are created by the board itself. While no official mention is made of the fact in any of the proceedings of the board, it may be surmised that a committee of executive officers was created to answer the need of a single executive officer.

An example of the type of function performed by the committee of executive officers is contained in the Official Proceedings for January 11, 1944, when that group reported concerning the eligibility of certain employees for membership in the retirement system.[3] For the school year ending 1945, the Official Proceedings contain eight reports from the committee of executive officers. These reports concern largely the matter of use of school properties and other matters involving all of the departments of the board.[4]

An unpublished chart of organization for the board of education places this committee in an advisory position and lists the superintendent of instruction as chairman.

---

[1] Forty-ninth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 220-21.

[2] Ibid., p. 35.

[3] Official Proceedings, op. cit., L (January 11, 1944), 666-67.

[4] Ibid., LI (1945), 14 (Index).

Outside Controls

The new law provided additional controls for the officers and members of the board of education through an annual inspection and revision of the books and accounts by experts not connected with and not selected by the board. The mayor of the city appointed annually one or more expert accountants whose duty it was to examine accounts and vouchers and make a report to the mayor with such criticisms and recommendations as they found proper. Also, as a check against mismanagement, the circuit court was given jurisdiction over the members of the board for their conduct in governing the schools with power to suspend and remove any offending member. Upon the petition of any member or officer of the board, or of ten citizens and householders, the circuit court was directed to exercise its jurisdiction.[1]

Interference by City

The independence of the Board of Education from municipal affairs has been discussed. However, during a program of building construction in 1912, the city supervisor of plumbing held that the board's continuous venting system was in violation of city rules.[2] The board held that its system was superior to that of the city from the standpoint of sanitation. The result was that the circuit court of the city decided that the school board was not subject to such rules and, after the hearing, issued an injunction.[3]

In another instance the city building commissioner brought prosecutions against individual members of the board for failure to install exterior fire escapes. The members of the board were found guilty and fined $100.00 in each case. The board was in the process of appealing the cases when a compromise was effected whereby the board agreed to withdraw the appeal and to fireproof the interior stairways and hallways of certain buildings designated by the city building commissioner. He agreed to desist

---

[1] Fifty-first Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, 1903, p. 9.

[2] Fifty-eighth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, 1912, p. 12.

[3] Ibid.

from further petition and to ask the court for remission of fines.[1]

Assumption of Executive Functions by Board

At the time of the survey of the St. Louis public schools, directed by Dr. Charles H. Judd in 1916, the charter had been in operation for nineteen years. The Annual Reports had from time to time expressed gratification of the smooth working of the organization. For example, the president of the board, in reporting for the year ending in 1912, said,

> The work of the Board itself is, therefore, usually one of ratification only and is exceedingly smooth and of short duration, but this is true only because its wheels have been well oiled by the prior careful and conscientious work of the heads of the departments and the committees and the close attention thereto of the Board's individual members.[2]

Dr. Judd, at the time of his survey, found that the charter of 1897 had served its purpose for many years and that it had proved a model fundamental law for the government of any school system. He did comment, however, upon the inherent weakness of the charter in dividing the responsibility among so many different departments without any single superior officer in turn responsible to the board of education. He further intimated that in spite of its splendid record, the organization might cause trouble.[3]

In 1903, Edward C. Eliot, former member of the St. Louis board wrote extensively in praise of the new law as set forth in the act of 1897. He did remark, however, concerning the possibility that the members of the board might attempt to encroach upon the powers of the officers. In such event, the members of the committees would gradually assume executive functions not rightfully belonging to them.[4]

The fact that the earliest superintendents in St. Louis did much to establish the importance of the superintendency has been indicated earlier in this chapter. The excellence of this

---

[1] Fifty-ninth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, 1913, p. 11.

[2] Fifty-eighth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 10.

[3] Charles H. Judd, Survey of the St. Louis Public Schools, Part I, pp. 54-58. New York: World Book Co., 1918.

[4] Forty-ninth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 35.

type of leadership was also manifested during the terms of superintendents Soldan and Blewett. In a tribute tendered to Blewett, a corps of teachers, principals, supervisors, and assistant superintendents in St. Louis wrote as follows:

> During the nine years of his administration of public instruction in St. Louis, Mr. Blewett has come to be recognized, both locally and nationally, as an educational leader of the greatest ability. His vision of the true place and function of public education in the complex life of a great modern city and of the administrative policy by which this vision should be realized was distinct and clearly defined. It was his deep desire so to organize and conduct the work of the public schools as to render to every legitimate interest of this city the greatest possible service, to increase the peoples' appreciation of the schools by demonstrating in every legitimate way their increasing value to the city.
>
> Not only in his clear vision of what ought to be done but in his remarkable ability to accomplish results in harmony with this policy, he stood without a peer in American city education. The substantial progress made by the public schools of St. Louis during his administration has not been equaled during any similar period in the history of the city. In addition to carrying out successfully improvements inaugurated by his great predecessor, Dr. F. Louis Soldan, he has expanded and improved the night schools, established summer schools, developed the extension department of the Harris Teachers College, the teachers' professional library, and the Educational Museum, opened the kindergartens to five-year-old children, established vocational courses in the High Schools, a Psycho-Educational Clinic, and Open-air Schools for anemic and pretubercular children. He has made a thorough-going revision of the entire course of study and secured a Bond Issue of $3,000,000.00 for the erection and improvement of school buildings.[1]

In commenting upon the forces making for unity in the St. Louis school system as described in his survey, Dr. Charles H. Judd attributed it to the personality and constant general supervision of the whole system exercised by the superintendent. He felt that the time might come when it would be necessary to insist that this fact be formally recognized. He found that the superintendent actually was using far greater power and influence than that accorded him by the rules of the board or by the provisions of the charter.[2]

In the year 1913, certain members of the board began to show a "management" type of interest in the internal affairs of

---

[1] Sixty-third Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, 1917, pp. 53-54.

[2] Judd, op. cit., p. 18.

the school. One member introduced a resolution that the rules of the board be amended so that the number of ranks of high-school assistants be reduced to three, and further recommended that the number belonging to the various ranks be restricted to given proportions. The superintendent of instruction had taken no part in the formation of this recommendation.[1]

The attorney of the board was asked to define the board's prerogative in such affairs. His report is quoted herewith:

> In response to the resolution adopted by the Board at its meeting of July 8, 1913, I herewith submit my opinion on the power of the Board to adopt and to put into effect the resolution offered by Dr. J. P. Harper at the May meeting of the Board. That resolution had for its object a material change in the organization of the teaching force and would have had an important bearing on the conduct of the schools. Its adoption was sought without regard to the opinion or recommendation thereon of the Superintendent of Instruction, and had it been adopted by the Board and put into operation, the teaching force of the schools and the conduct of the schools generally would have been materially affected against the judgment and advice of the Superintendent of Instruction.[2]

In a discussion of this matter, it was pointed out that if the board of education, as distinguished from its instruction department, were to exercise such power as was attempted to be invoked by the resolution presented, the superintendent would soon be without a voice in the organization of the teaching force. Such matters were considered to be the province of an expert trained in the field of education.[3]

In 1919 a difference arose between the principal of the McKinley High School and the superintendent of instruction. The principal in disciplining a high-school senior ruled that the student would not be able to sit with the class and participate in the commencement exercises. The case reached the superintendent, who, after investigation, informed the principal that the boy should not be held from the exercises on account of the incident. The principal resented the ruling of his superior and delayed the exercises as a result of his indignation. The principal wrote a letter of resignation and later amended it to the effect

---

[1] Official Proceedings, op. cit., XIX (May 13, 1913), 964-65.

[2] Fifty-ninth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 251.

[3] Ibid., p. 253.

that he would not resign until the end of the school year, since the incident had occurred during mid-year. The superintendent held that there was no need for considering the case at once as the matter of reappointment would be regularly taken up at the close of the year. The board passed a resolution upholding the action of the principal in his handling of the incident. The board held that the principal had followed action which would maintain the high moral standards of the St. Louis public schools.[1]

Certain groups within the city became concerned over the activities of the board of education during this period. In 1921 upon the occasion of the leaving of Dr. Withers, superintendent of instruction, the board of education received a letter from a committee of the League of Women Voters which stated in part:

> We are just now closing an exceedingly unfortunate chapter in the history of our schools and of the Board of Education of St. Louis. For reasons which e'er long may be made clear to all, an educator of the highest national repute, acting as directing head of our school system is passing out, having failed for almost four years, to secure the harmonious co-operation of the members of your honorable Board. To the citizens of St. Louis the selection of Dr. Withers' successor becomes a task of greatest moment, and one in which they wish to helpfully participate. A man pre-eminently qualified, an out-standing figure in the field of American educators must be found to measure up to the difficulties of this position and to the dignity of St. Louis as a city leading in modern school methods.[2]

When Withers refused to allow his name to become before the board for reappointment, Mr. John J. Maddox, principal of the Cleveland High School was appointed acting superintendent and later was made superintendent.[3] However, harmonious relations with the board did not prevail entirely throughout the period of his superintendency.

A study of the board's proceedings for the year 1925 indicates lack of agreement in approval of the proposals of officers and of committee reports. Upon the nomination of a principal for the Elias Michael School, there was much criticism and the super-

---

[1] Official Proceedings, op. cit., XXV (February 11, 1919), 795-811.

[2] Ibid., XXVII (January 11, 1921), 577.

[3] Sixty-seventh Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, 1921, p. 14.

intendent's recommendation won only by a vote of eight to four.[1] Disagreements also apparently existed between the superintendent of instruction and the commissioner of school buildings, as one report contained a statement of a board member deploring such disharmony and stating it to be of long standing.[2]

The reorganization proposed by Superintendent Maddox, in which five divisions were created to assist in the management of the schools thereby relieving three assistant superintendents, also caused a considerable amount of dissension in the board. His proposal, however, was adopted on May 11, 1926.[3] The situation was described by the president of the board on December 13, 1927, when he said,

> Let me say, gentlemen, that it is plainly evident that some of the actions of the Board in reviewing the action of the Superintendent shows the members were not sufficiently posted to know what they were doing. Their motives were the very best in the world, but it is just as well we learn a little lesson here. It is not always good to reject the things that are recommended by people in charge, and I am personally of the opinion that unless this Board can function with a little more uniformity either I am of the wrong opinion or am in the wrong place. I have given very much thought to this matter recently and I am very much afraid that on some of these things we are on the wrong track. I shall have to vote for the Superintendent's recommendations; and if he does not know what he is doing, I am going to vote for his retirement.[4]

The appointment of a director of a bureau of reference, research, and publicity for the board of education appears to have been a further step toward assumption of executive control through this officer. On April 10, 1928, the superintendent's proposals that the positions of supervisor of mathematics and assistant in the division of personnel be created were referred to the director of the bureau of reference, research, and publicity for study and report.[5] A month later the board appointed a committee to study the plan of the superintendent of instruction on

---

[1] Official Proceedings, op. cit., XXXII (November 10, 1925), 505.

[2] Ibid. (November 10, 1925), pp. 523-25.

[3] Ibid. (May 11, 1926), p. 1075.

[4] Ibid., XXXIV (December 13, 1927), 675.

[5] Ibid. (April 10, 1928), p. 1135.

rating applicants and the committee was given the privilege of inviting the new director to assist in the work.[1]

The director of reference, research, and publicity set about to determine the necessity of a supervisor of mathematics by submitting a questionnaire to the teachers in which he asked them to comment relative to the merits of "general" versus "special" supervision. The results indicated a preference for general supervision, whereupon the director issued the following report to the board:

> From the fact above submitted your investigator concludes that the position of Supervisor of Mathematics ought not to be created at this time, because we do not need more subject Supervisors to come between the school principal and his duties and responsibilities for classroom instruction.
>
> We do need more general supervision, both men and women, ranking as district superintendents with executive authority delegated to them, going out from headquarters into the schools to assist and inspire competent principals in the management of their schools. We do need enough competent assistant superintendents, both men and women, possessing delegated executive authority to administer, direct, and supervise definite fields of educational activity. There should be restored to our school system some plan of administration that will include effective delegated executive authority and responsibility proceeding from headquarters by direct and well-recognized lines of control to the school principal.[2]

The board failed to reappoint the superintendent for the ensuing year (1929). Upon this occasion one member commented that he felt the board was making a mistake and that he had watched the tendency of the board, through individual members and committees, to undertake the actual operation of the school system. This member further stated that he believed the chief fault could be traced to the board's methods of pursuing business and not to those of the superintendent.[3] This same member spoke with equal vehemence when the newly elected superintendent reappointed the director of reference, research, and publicity to the position of acting assistant superintendent, the position which he had held when the former superintendent's reorganization

---

[1] Ibid. (June, 1927-May, 1928), p. 1707.

[2] Ibid., XXXV (March 12, 1929), 1106-40.

[3] Ibid., XXXVI (July 9, 1929), 178.

displaced him.[1] The position of director of reference, research, and publicity was abolished on October 8, 1929.[2]

Some measure of harmony seemed to prevail after the appointment of the new superintendent in 1929. The president reported favorably for the year ending in 1930 concerning progressive practices in school administration through the establishing of definite lines of authority from the superintendent to assistant superintendent, to principal, and to teacher. Through the workings of the new organization, the president reported an improvement in morale and efficiency throughout the system.[3]

The Strayer Survey

The St. Louis system was studied by a survey staff directed by Dr. George D. Strayer in 1939. In discussing the administration of the system, it was stated that a closer relationship was needed between the office of the secretary-treasurer and the superintendent of instruction, and indicated further that there was lack of proper administrative relationship existing between these offices and those of the commissioner of school buildings and the supply commissioner.[4] Among the chief recommendations made for this aspect of the schools were those designed to strengthen the office of superintendent of instruction. The six recommendations made are reviewed here.

1. The board of education should establish a chief executive officer, the superintendent of schools, to nominate all associate or assistant superintendents, supervisors, directors, principals, teachers, and other professional or nonprofessional employees. This would be opposed to the plan of co-ordinate executive officers existing in St. Louis but would centralize both authority and responsibility in the superintendent.

2. The board should require the superintendent to make

---

[1] Ibid. (July 9, 1929), p. 187.

[2] Ibid. (October 8, 1929), p. 494.

[3] Seventy-sixth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, 1930, p. 10.

[4] George D. Strayer, "The Administration of the School System," A Report of a Survey of the Public Schools of St. Louis Missouri, p. 243. New York: Bureau of Publications, Columbia University, 1939.

all recommendations in professional matters. Under such a plan all other members of the professional staff could be utilized, but the chief responsibility would rest with the superintendent.

3. The board should require the superintendent to keep it informed concerning the achievement and progress that are being made in the school system. Discussions should be provided for the board in such matters as curricular offerings, salary schedules, teaching assignments, retirement problems, and school and community relations.

4. The responsibility for the development of the budget should rest with the superintendent. In his handling of this matter he would depend upon the assistance of an expert trained in business practices, but the final budget should be that presented by the superintendent.

5. The board should require the superintendent to keep it fully informed concerning the need for new sites and buildings. This would require the scientific study of population shifts, new developments, and building programs.

6. The board should not concern itself with the details of administration in the operation of the schools. In these matters the board would require performance by the superintendent of schools as its agent.[1]

Shortly after the Strayer survey, the St. Louis public schools became the subject of city-wide comment. As a result of the current situation at that time, the superintendent, Dr. Henry J. Gerling, resigned. Much unfavorable publicity was spread upon the newspapers of the city, typical of which is the following:

> Gerling's retirement brings the third change among the six executive officers of the board in the last year. Last September George W. Sanger, Building Commissioner, killed himself immediately after resigning his office. Not long after that, one of his principal aids, Frank A. Borgstadt, committed suicide. About a year ago Charles Lee Barr was demoted from Supply Commissioner and recently he went to prison under a four-year term for embezzlement of school funds.
>
> Superintendents of Instruction are elected for four-year terms and can be removed only for cause. Gerling, formerly an assistant superintendent, who then served a half year as acting superintendent, was in the middle of his third full term when he quit. He assumed the job when the board and the system were torn by dissension after the stormy careers as

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 253-54.

Superintendent of John J. Maddox and Maddox's predecessor, John W. Withers, each of whom lasted just a term.[1]

Action in Selecting Recent Superintendents

In selecting a successor to Superintendent Gerling, the board asked Washington University, St. Louis University, and The University of Missouri to furnish representatives to form a group to select an outstanding educator as the new superintendent of instruction for the city of St. Louis. Dr. Homer W. Anderson was appointed by the board to the position after careful consideration by the committee selected to make recommendations to the board of education. Dr. Anderson was considered, therefore, to be in a position which would free him from obligation or dictation from any particular group.[2]

Prior to the expiration of Anderson's term of office, the board of education expressed great dissatisfaction with the results which he had effected in the schools. Newspapers carried lengthy accounts of the controversy between the board and Anderson. One editorial dealing with this situation closed with the following statements:

> The board itself--not Mr. Anderson--has persisted in maintaining its small standing committees dealing with specific areas of school affairs, which by the inevitable processes of logrolling and back scratching makes each committee virtual king over its own little province. The Board refused to approve a plan for complete reconstruction of its organization, reducing its size and clearing the way for a new membership.
>
> Mr. Anderson's basic failure is that he has refused, mistakenly to go to the mat with his board on such issues. He has temporized when he should have stood firm. But the board itself is the voting power on reorganizing its structure and function, and the board cannot evade responsibility by saying the superintendent should have been more belligerent and insistent in saving members from their own errors.
>
> The Board has broken every superintendent of instruction for a quarter of a century, directly or indirectly. Not a single basic problem in the St. Louis schools will be solved by breaking Mr. Anderson. If we need a new superintendent, well and good. But the fundamental need is a new board, or a new spirit in the board which many of the present members show precious few signs of possessing.[3]

---

[1] St. Louis Post-Dispatch, January 16, 1940.

[2] Eighty-seventh Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, 1941, p. 9.

[3] St. Louis Star Times, June 24, 1942.

The members of the committee on instruction, on July 14, 1942, offered a resolution to the board to conduct a hearing on the proposition of removing Superintendent Anderson.[1] In the midst of this controversy, Anderson requested a leave of absence extending to the expiration of his term of office in order to accept a position in the Treasury Department of the United States as administrator of the sale of war savings stamps and bonds. This was granted.[2] On September 8, 1942, Assistant Superintendent Hickey was elected acting superintendent of instruction effective that date to August 1, 1944.[3]

On July 25, 1944, Hickey was appointed superintendent of instruction for a four-year term. At the time of his appointment, the following measures were attributed to his leadership: (1) the core-curriculum for secondary schools; (2) an improved reading program; (3) the use of the teachers' colleges for in-service training of teachers; (4) the extension of school libraries; (5) the wider use of radio in education; (6) the broadening of the visual education program; and, (7) a workable single salary schedule for certificated employees.[4] It was further stated:

> It is especially to be noted that during this period there has been a constant improvement in relations between employees of the Instruction Department, characterized by more co-operation and confidence than has been evidenced for a number of years.[5]

---

[1] Official Proceedings, op. cit., XLIX (July 14, 1942), 148-49.

[2] Ibid. (August 27, 1942), p. 193.

[3] Ibid. (September 8, 1942), pp. 196-97.

[4] Ibid., LI (July 25, 1944), 133-34.

[5] Ibid. (July 25, 1944), p. 133.

CHAPTER IV

DEVELOPMENT OF A PROFESSIONAL STAFF

The earliest schools in St. Louis were taught by teachers who were without the guidance of trained superintendents. The members of the boards of directors, however, served more or less as "overseers." By 1851 the schools did have the guidance of Superintendent Tice whose writings give evidence of sound educational ideas. The rapid growth of the schools brought about a need for additional professional leadership. It is the purpose of this chapter to indicate how a professional staff was developed.

The Assistant Superintendent

As the work of the superintendent of instruction became more complicated by the growth and development of the schools, the position of assistant superintendent was created. The first such position was created by the board in August, 1865, with the establishment of the office of assistant superintendent of the German department and the appointment of Mr. Francis Berg to that office. During his first year, Berg visited as frequently as possible the schools in which German was taught, examined the classes, and made such suggestions for improvement as he deemed appropriate. He required reports from the German teachers, abstracted the reports, made observations of his own, and submitted reports to the superintendent. He also held meetings of the German teachers for the purpose of consulting about textbooks and methods of instruction.[1]

At the time of making his second report for the German department, the board had adopted rules governing the assistant superintendent for the German Department as follows:

> An Assistant Superintendent for the German Department is to be appointed, who shall take charge of classes himself and supervise all the German classes. He shall devise such plans

---

[1] Twelfth Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, 1866, pp. 38-39.

> and measures as may be expedient or necessary, and report quarterly or semi-annually to the Superintendent or the Board the condition of said classes. He shall furnish the different German teachers with instructions respecting the lessons and books, and is empowered to convene them at some convenient time to consult with them about the best methods and other matters pertaining to his department. He shall be present at the office twice a week at some time convenient to him and to the German teachers: He shall visit at least two schools during one week, without neglecting his classes: he shall examine the different schools and classes at the end of every scholastic year independent of the General Examination, and in general be governed by the corresponding rules and regulations of the Board applicable to him as teacher and officer.[1]

In 1867, a second assistant superintendent was appointed in the person of Wm. T. Harris. At the suggestion of Superintendent Divoll, Harris began a general examination of the condition of the schools with respect to the mode and efficiency of the teaching of reading.[2]

During the months of March and April in 1867, Harris visited all the schools under control of the board and examined the different grades as minutely as the time allowed. As the first requisite of good reading he noted distinctness of enunciation, loudness, and correct pronunciation. As a second, he emphasized proper observance of punctuation, inflection, emphasis, and rhetorical pauses. To correct defects of too rapid and indistinct articulation, he recommended the introduction and use of Dr. Leigh's Phonetic Primer which he had used successfully at the Clay School. He found the reading textbooks somewhat unsatisfactory. He placed high values on good literature and stated that "next to religion in a national culture is the influence of literature." With respect to grammar, he longed for some system which would secure correct use of language through a logical and scientific approach. He deplored the influence of the "dead language" system on our methods.[3]

In his comments concerning penmanship, Harris stated that in his opinion no branch of education needed more careful and constant attention than writing. He felt it would be a wise move for the board to employ "some man of energy, and fertility of resources," as a special teacher of this subject. It would not be his duty to relieve the regular teachers from the task of instruc-

---

[1] Thirteenth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 76.

[2] Ibid., p. 56. [3] Ibid., pp. 56-59.

tion in this subject, but would bring aid and stimulation in it.[1]

Other subjects commented upon by Harris were history and constitution of the United States, geography, singing, spelling, and reviews. In addition, he made a study of the number of hours which the students in the high school and district schools were spending in study outside of school.[2] He devoted a considerable amount of attention in his report to the matter of the course of study. He believed the American idea of education to be based upon the principle that: "not what the teacher does for the pupil, but what he gets the pupil to do for himself, is of value." The great object of the course of study was, in his opinion, the equipping of every citizen to read with intelligence and discrimination for full participation in our system of government.[3]

By 1868 Harris had become the superintendent of instruction. He was assisted by W. D. Butler and Francis Berg who remained the assistant superintendent of the German department.[4] An examination of their reports reveals the nature of their duties.

Upon entering his duties, Butler visited and became acquainted with the condition of the thirty-seven schools then under the care of the board. At the suggestion of Harris, Butler examined the pupils' knowledge with respect to the Spencerian system of penmanship and found commendable results. He advocated the employment of a special teacher of penmanship to visit all the schools and to instruct the teachers how best to advance their pupils' to secure higher attainments.[5] He also reported that "in the other branches of study, the examinations at the close of the school year fully sustained the reputation of our schools and exhibited the interest manifested by our people in their prosperity."[6]

Assistant Superintendent Butler defended the board's extensive program of school building construction and intimated that as better accommodations prevailed, more highly educated teachers would be demanded. He commented concerning the lack of uniformity in the published reports of public schools in the various cities of the country which made it difficult to obtain a satisfactory

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 61-62. [2] Ibid., p. 71. [3] Ibid., pp. 71-73.

[4] Fourteenth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 2.

[5] Ibid., p. 73. [6] Ibid.

basis for salary comparisons. In a study of available data, he concluded that while the minimum salary in St. Louis was higher than that in Chicago or Cincinnati, the average salary in St. Louis was lower.[1]

Assistant Superintendent Berg of the German Department, discussed the program for German instruction in the schools. He reported the total number of children in the public schools attending German instruction to be 2,476. He stated that the number would be greatly increased if there were a plan for "infant-teaching." He advised that German be begun in the primary department of the schools and that only the best German teachers should undertake it.

Berg considered instruction in German language to be an educational element no less important than music, calisthenics, and "other means outside of reading and cyphering." He set forth a plan for instruction of English-speaking pupils as well as that for German-speaking children.

He reported that he had been able to discuss matters of importance at monthly meetings by dividing the Teachers' Association into several classes. Through such meetings he sought to attain uniformity and to investigate different subjects. In seeking to obtain better instruction, he urged the board to establish a class for training German-English teachers.[2] The position of the assistant superintendent of German instruction was strengthened during the school year ending in 1869 by making him also an officer of the English department.[3]

It is interesting to note that at the time of first appointment of the two assistant superintendents, each submitted an annual report to the superintendent of instruction which he in turn included as a part of his annual report. However, for the next several years the superintendent's report carried only the report of the assistant superintendent of the German department. In reporting for the school year ending in 1870, F. Louis Soldan, assistant superintendent of the German department, stated his views in regard to the purpose of public schools in the following statement:

> The Public Schools are the mints from which the commonwealth expects to receive the coined intellectual gold of the

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 75-76. [2] Ibid., pp. 79-87.

[3] Fifteenth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 93.

> future, and it depends on their efficacy how much of noble metal and how much of worthless slag the raw ore, which is entrusted to them, shall yield. To bring to light and to refine even the smallest grain of intellectual gold embedded in our pupils' minds, is the task of our schools; education and its medium, instruction, are the means of achieving this end.[1]

Continuing his report, he discussed in some detail each of the following subjects: relation between state and school, American principles of education, self-government, discipline and order, corporal punishment, education of the character, instruction, reading and English grammar, foreign languages, German--advantages of its study, introduction of German into the district schools, and public school library.[2]

During the early years after the creation of the office of assistant superintendent, the two officers appointed to the position spent all of their time during school hours in visiting the schools and inspecting the work, or conferring with the teachers regarding special matters pertaining to the conduct of the schools, with one of the assistants giving special attention to the regulation of German instruction.[3] By 1872, the board of education had adopted a rule defining the position of the assistant superintendents. It is quoted herewith:

> Rule 35. The Assistant Superintendents, one of whom shall be proficient in German, shall aid the Superintendent in performing the work devolving upon him by the rules and regulations of the Board, and they shall, further, occupy their whole time during the sessions of the schools in visiting the various departments of the same, except when required by the Superintendent to assist him in the performance of other duties. They shall, further, report to the Superintendent, weekly, or oftener, in writing, giving the details of their observations in the schools, and recommending such measures as they deem conducive to the interests of the same.[4]

In 1888 German was discontinued and the time of the German superintendent was at once wholly utilized in the fundamental English branches.[5]

---

[1] Sixteenth Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, 1870, pp. 181-82.

[2] Ibid., pp. 182-97.

[3] Eighteenth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 165.

[4] Ibid., p. xi.

[5] Thirty-fourth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 10-11.

By 1891 the number of assistant superintendents was increased to three,[1] and in 1903 to four.[2] Each of the four assistant superintendents visited regularly the schools of a district within the city assigned to him. The superintendent of instruction held weekly meetings for his assistants for the purpose of agreeing to principles to be enforced in school work and of establishing harmony and uniformity of supervision. The details of each week's work was discussed and a common basis established and maintained for supervisory work.[3] One other purpose of the weekly meetings was to provide an opportunity for the assistants to obtain rulings on any doubtful questions which they encountered during their visits to the schools.[4] By 1915 the plan had been modified slightly to effect a plan where each of the four assistants had a district of given schools, but one was given all the high schools in addition to some of the elementary schools. Dr. Withers, although not listed officially in the report as an assistant superintendent, was given that rank and was assigned Harris Teachers College, the Gallaudet, New Open Air, Special No. 7, and the Wyman School as well as the psycho-educational clinic.[5]

By 1920 changes in the organization of the administrative staff were being made almost each year. For the school year ending in 1921, the superintendent was being assisted by five assistant superintendents and one assistant to the superintendent.[6] An additional assistant superintendent was added for the year 1922.[7] In the spring of 1926 a reorganization for the department of instruction was proposed by the superintendent and approved by the board of education. The object of the reorganization was to secure a definite placement of responsibility for all transactions

---

[1] Thirty-seventh Annual Report, op. cit., p. 15.

[2] Forty-ninth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 235. [3] Ibid.

[4] Fifty-third Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, 1907, p. 298.

[5] Official Proceedings, op. cit., XXII (September 14, 1915), 212-13.

[6] Sixty-seventh Annual Report, op. cit., p. 194.

[7] Sixty-eighth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, 1922, p. 82.

in the department of instruction and to increase the general efficiency of administration. The new organization reduced the number of assistant superintendents from six to three and increased the number of directors of divisions from four to nine, and further provided for the temporary release of certain principals to act as assistants in the supervision of schools.[1] The three assistant superintendents were aided by two district superintendents who had charge of the various supervisors.

For the school year, 1928-29, the organization which had been established two years earlier had undergone some revision. The organization listed three assistant superintendents. One was given direction of all secondary schools including vocational schools. Also under his supervision were two district superintendents and two supervisors, one for special schools and the other for evening schools. The district superintendents, under the guidance of the assistant superintendent, had charge of the elementary schools. Another assistant superintendent was given charge of all the special supervisors. The third assistant superintendent was given direction of all the various divisions of the educational services. The purpose of the new organization was to give specialized service to all areas of the schools.[2]

When a new superintendent of instruction was appointed in July, 1929, the administrative organization was again revised with the approval of the board of education for the stated purpose of establishing the line of authority in connection with all school activities.[3] The assignment of administrative authority to two assistant and eight district superintendents under that revision was as follows: (1) teachers colleges--one president; (2) secondary schools--one acting assistant superintendent of instruction, assisted by two district superintendents in charge of high and intermediate schools, respectively; (3) vocational schools--one acting assistant superintendent, assisted by one district superintendent; (4) special and evening schools--one district superintendent; and (5) regular elementary schools--four

---

[1] Seventy-third Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, 1927, pp. 13-17.

[2] Seventy-fifth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, 1929, pp. 17-19.

[3] Seventy-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 21.

district superintendents, each in charge of a separate group of schools.[1]

The following year nine assistant superintendents were listed.[2] However, beginning with the year 1932-33, the number was reduced to eight,[3] in 1933-34 to seven,[4] in 1934-35 to six,[5] and by 1941-42 to three.[6]

By 1943 the number of assistant superintendents was increased to four, each in charge of a functional area. The assistant superintendents were given general direction of the following areas within the department of instruction: (1) department of elementary schools; (2) department of secondary schools; (3) department of instruction and research; and (4) department of teacher and pupil personnel.[7]

It is an interesting fact, that after the creation of the office of assistant superintendent in March, 1867, the superintendents of instruction for the next several decades were chosen from the assistant superintendents. Superintendents Harris,[8] Long,[9] Soldan,[10] Blewett,[11] and Withers,[12] had at some time previous to

---

[1] Ibid., p. 22.

[2] Seventy-seventh Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, 1931, p. 32.

[3] Seventy-ninth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, 1933, p. 14.

[4] Eightieth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, 1934, p. 54.

[5] Eighty-first Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, 1935, p. 58.

[6] Eighty-eighth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, 1942, p. 18.

[7] Official Proceedings, op. cit., L (July 13, 1943), 117-22.

[8] Thirteenth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 56.

[9] Twenty-fifth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 3.

[10] Fifty-fourth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, 1908, p. 23.

[11] Fifty-third Annual Report, op. cit., p. 3.

[12] Official Proceedings, op. cit., XXII (September 14, 1915), 212-13.

their elections as superintendents, served with the rank of assistant superintendent. Maddox, appointed to succeed Withers, had been in the service of the St. Louis schools for some time. At the time of his appointment he was serving as principal of Cleveland High School.[1] Gerling, successor to Maddox, had served as assistant superintendent.[2] The appointment of Anderson as superintendent in 1940 was a distinct departure in the practice of appointing superintendents of instruction.[3] Anderson had had no prior service in the St. Louis public schools. At the time of his appointment he was serving as superintendent in Omaha, Nebraska.

The board of education set another precedent in the policy of choosing superintendents of instruction when Hickey was appointed. Hickey had previously served the board of education as its secretary-treasurer, to which office he was appointed on January 1, 1935.[4] On January 9, 1940, upon the recommendation of Superintendent Gerling, the board appointed Hickey, secretary-treasurer of the board, to serve also as assistant superintendent in charge of business affairs.[5] From the time of creation of the office of assistant superintendent, each succeeding superintendent had been chosen from the rank of assistant superintendent with the exception of Maddox and Anderson, the latter being the only one having had no prior service in the St. Louis schools.

The School Principal

The first public schools established in St. Louis were conducted according to the Lancasterian or monitorial system. The schoolrooms required for such schools were comparatively simple. A large study hall with one or more smaller rooms sufficed. The position of the principal in these schools was important. He occupied the large hall, preserved order during study periods, and instructed one or more classes. Assistant teachers or monitors

---

[1] Ibid., XXVIII (July 19, 1921), 128a.

[2] Ibid., XXXVI (July 15, 1929), 182.

[3] Eighty-sixth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, 1940, p. 12.

[4] Eighty-first Annual Report, op. cit., p. 5.

[5] Official Proceedings, op. cit., XLVI (January 15, 1940), 626.

held classes in the adjoining rooms. Such a system was cumbersome. When the Franklin School was constructed, it contained six large rooms measuring 67 by 32 feet, with three classrooms attached to each. The school was thus intended to house six separate and independent schools of 200 pupils under six principals.[1]

The decade from 1857 to 1867 witnessed several fundamental changes in the system of public schools in the city of St. Louis. One of the most fundamental changes was the displacement of the old monitorial plan by a system of graded schools. By the end of that period, it became a stated policy of the board to consolidate all departments within any one building under one principal as soon as circumstances would justify such action.[2]

The advisability of placing administrative responsibility for the local management of the school in the hands of the principal was recognized very early by the board of education. As early as 1859 the work of the principal was summarized as follows:

> The order of exercises in each school has been greatly improved and systematized. In accordance with instructions from the Board at the beginning of the scholastic year, the principals were required to organize their schools in such a manner as to give to themselves an hour or half-hour each day, for the purpose of supervising the instruction and discipline in their assistants' classes. The schools were so organized, the principals becoming to a certain extent local superintendents, and this feature has contributed much to the better administration of the schools. A programme of the order of exercises in each department is made to the Superintendent at the beginning of each school year.[3]

Rules were adopted for the guidance of the principals. The first rules were constructed for "principal teachers." These regulations required that the principal (1) keep a register in which was entered the name, age, birth-place, residence, and date of admission for each pupil entering the school for the first time, together with the name and occupation of the parent or guardian; (2) make a daily record of attendance and submit quarterly and annual reports to the superintendent on prescribed forms; (3) have general supervision of the grounds, buildings, and appurtenances of the school, and be responsible for the neatness and cleanliness of the premises, notifying the superintendent in all cases of needed repairs; (4) report to their respective

---

[1] Thirteenth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 110-11.

[2] Ibid., p. 116. [3] Fifth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 51.

schools thirty minutes prior to the opening of each morning session, and meet once monthly at the office of the superintendent for purposes of consultation; (5) furnish to the superintendent within one week after the beginning of each quarter, the program of daily exercises in the various rooms of his school; and (6) examine the classes of the assistants as often as practicable, without neglecting the pupils under his own immediate charge.[1]

The president of the board in his report for the school year, 1869, recommended an increase in the duties of principals of first-class (twelve-room) schools. His remarks were as follows:

> I have been for some time convinced that more general duties must be imposed upon the principals of the first-class schools; that the supervision of all the schools below the first grade should be placed, to a large extent, under the principals of those schools to which the former promote their highest classes. The additional assistance required by the principals of the first-class schools will, as therein suggested, be, in a great measure, compensated for by the greater number accommodated in the principal's room, a saving being effected thereby in rent and fuel. But the consolidation and efficiency introduced throughout all the grades of the district schools by this method is, itself, of incalculable advantage.[2]

Superintendent Harris, writing in the same report, expressed approval of this idea and attested to its use in such cities as Boston, Cincinnati, and Chicago.[3]

The following year, the president expressed great satisfaction with the plan because of the advantages gained to the schools.[4] The plan, as adopted, caused about twenty principals of the first-class schools to serve as local supervisors of the primary schools situated in their respective districts. Only advisory powers were delegated. The extent of those duties were concerned with examining classes, observing the methods of instruction and discipline, holding consultations with the principal of the subordinate school, and reporting to the superintendent. An organization of these principals, including those of the normal, high, and intermediate schools, met almost weekly with the super-

---

[1] Fourteenth Annual Report, op. cit., p. xli.

[2] Fifteenth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 11.

[3] Ibid., p. 133.

[4] Sixteenth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 9.

intendent for practical discussion of questions relating to the course of study and methods of instruction or to discipline and management. Through these meetings an attempt was made to establish a standard of correct work against which performance could be measured and scientific methods for improvement set up.[1]

After two years of trial, the position of supervising principal seems to have been fairly well established. In spite of the increase in his supervisory duties, the principal was required to hear not less than two, nor more than four, daily recitations in the highest grade under his charge. Harris felt that the principal should be a teacher and have daily duties as such. In so doing, he would regard the work of the school from its minute details, thus supplementing the work of the superintendent, who sees general results. The guiding principle in defining the duties of supervising principals was defined by Harris as follows:

> Local supervision should not be extended so far as to encroach on central supervision, that of the general superintendent, nor so far on the other hand as to relieve of responsibility the subordinate principals. An equilibrium of these interests must be preserved. It is obvious that unless there is harmony of action between these, there cannot result any good from the endeavor of the superintendent. Independence in the proper sense of the form is to be achieved not through mutual limitation, but rather through mutual agreement and concert of action. All must be broad enough to comprehend the purposes of each.[2]

As further evidence of the established position of the supervising principal, the board established rules concerning their supervisory activities. Such principals as designated by the board were directed to visit the schools at least once each week, confer with the principals thereof, and to report to the superintendent on prescribed forms with respect to general condition of the schools, efficiency of teachers in discipline and instruction, classes examined and conditions discovered, classes approved for promotion from grade to grade, or from one book to another, any irregularities discovered in observance of board rules, and date and amount of time consumed in each visit. The rules further required that the principals consult with the superintendent each

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 197-98.

[2] Seventeenth Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, 1871, p. 190.

week for the purpose of improvement of schools, that they forward consolidated reports of their respective schools to the superintendent, that they conduct not less than two nor more than four of the daily recitations of the first grade under their charge, and finally that they report to the teachers' committee, whenever required, the standing and general efficiency of each teacher under their supervision with regard to discipline and instruction.[1]

Superintendent Soldan, in his report for the year ending in 1898, stated that there was no more important office in the whole school organization than that of the principal. In the daily functioning of the school system, the board operated on the idea that the principal was the one in whom was vested the highest local authority. According to his own judgment, each principal was expected to direct his school and arrange every detail thereof. The superintendent made criticisms and offered suggestions to any given teacher only through the principal of that school. The principal was held directly responsible by the board for the condition of the building. Through him, every official communication was sent to the teachers.

The great authority vested in the principal, in Soldan's opinion, was accompanied with duties correspondingly great. In his writings concerning the principal, he discussed the following topics: principal and community, principal and school board, relative importance of duties, principal and teachers, qualifications of principals, the principal's influence, and principal's report on teachers.

Establishing the popularity of the school in the community was set as one of the great things to be achieved by the principal. In so doing, the entire cause of public education was being served. To accomplish this end, principals were urged to make the instruction and discipline within the schools as efficient as possible. This was not to be interpreted as merely aiming to please the parents. What was required was the strict attention of the principal to his business, a kindliness of disposition toward patrons and children, and a desire to satisfy just demands.

In his relationship to the board of education, the principal was expected to serve as a trusted and confidential agent. No attempt was made by the board to regulate all the time of the

---

[1] Ibid., pp. xxvii-xxviii.

school principal. He was expected to use good judgment in his actions, and, therefore, was allowed wide latitude in rendering decisions. He was expected to adhere rigidly and in great detail to such regulations as the board did establish concerning his activities and functions. He also served as the agent of the board in certain money matters. He was expected to keep a record of textbook sales and turn the money over promptly together with all reports required concerning the same.

With respect to the great variety of duties falling to the principal, he was urged to exercise caution in performing them. There was danger that too much time would be consumed in matters of merely routine nature with a consequent sacrifice in the amount of attention given to his role as leader and guide to both teachers and pupils. The principal who could manage his time so that he might spend most of the day in the schoolroom, among children and teachers for the purpose of being helpful to both, was considered to be fortunate. In so doing, the influence of his personality would be felt in every corner of the school and ultimately in every home of the district. He was urged to become acquainted with as many pupils as possible in order that he might become influential among them.

The principal was expected to educate his corps of teachers, for purposes of harmonizing the work of the school, through daily visits to the classrooms and conversations with the pupils, teachers, and parents. In the second place, teachers' meetings were recommended as a useful device in harmonizing and unifying the work. In his dealings with teachers, the principal was expected to create an atmosphere where teachers would speak freely and without any fear on any matter pertaining to the work of the school.

The principal was urged to continual self-improvement through reading and study. His position was one which called for superior scholarly attainments, pedagogical skill, and executive ability. He was expected to maintain a professional skill and interest in advance of the teachers. In short, he was to be the example to all teachers.

The principal was more than an example or guide to the teachers, he was a judge of their qualifications by virtue of the rules of the board. He, therefore, needed more than mere scholarship or practical ability. It was essential that he have moral

courage and the readiness to incur the responsibilities imposed by his position. He was expected to discover errors in instruction and management and make suggestions relative to improvement. In such matters it was expected that he would maintain a relationship fostering good will and loyalty in his corps. He would not, for example, ever criticize a teacher in front of a class. He would recognize the good points of a teacher's work as well as those points needing correction.

One of the important duties assigned to principals was that of reporting inefficiency on the part of teachers. These reports were made half-quarterly and toward the end of the school year. Teachers were not expected to be reported for inefficiency until the teacher had been communicated with and given a chance to remedy the difficulty. Such cases were not expected very often since only capable, tried teachers could receive appointment. However, the principal was expected to safeguard the rights of the child by calling attention to any physical or mental conditions interfering with the efficiency of any teacher.[1]

By 1904 the duties of the school principals had become chiefly supervisory except in schools of Classes F and G. Salaries of principals were fixed in accordance with the size of the school which he supervised. Schools having more than eighteen or more assistants were classified as Class A Schools; fourteen to seventeen assistants, Class B Schools; ten to thirteen assistants, Class C Schools; eight or nine assistants, Class D Schools; five to seven assistants, Class E Schools; three or four assistants, Class F Schools; one or two assistants, Class G Schools. Salaries ranged from $2,400 for principals of the largest schools to $728 for principals of a school of one or two rooms. High-school principals received a maximum salary of $3,600.[2]

By 1934 the principals of the schools were classified as follows: teachers' college, high-schools, vocational schools, intermediate schools, regular elementary schools, special elementary schools. A further division of classification was made for principals of elementary schools by the board upon recommendation of the superintendent of instruction according to merit as follows:

---

[1] Forty-fourth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 79-95.

[2] Fiftieth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, 1904, p. 63.

A Class, B Class, C Class, and D Class. The board provided, however, that the number of A-Class principals should not at any time exceed seventy-five, and that the number of B-Class principals should not exceed twenty.[1]

Principals were reclassified by action of the board of education in 1943 as follows: teachers' college; high-schools; technical high schools; and school administrative unit. The principals in the latter group were further classified as A, B, or C, according to merit by the board of education,[2] upon the recommendation of the superintendent of instruction.

In spite of the frequent changes in the organization of administrative officers above the school principal, his status and function remained stable. By 1930 his position was described as follows:

> The principal is regarded as the executive head of his school. He stands in the line of authority; and every element of local school control is exercised through him. Corollary to this fact the principal is the responsible agent in the school for all phases of management and instruction. It is the business of the principal to secure the best possible educational results and to do this with the utmost efficiency. All types of special service which is extended to the schools by the Board of Education are to be utilized in the school under his direction.
>
> St. Louis has long been known for the outstanding quality of the principals who have been placed in charge of the various schools. These principals have been selected for the most part, not only because they possess a high degree of training for their work, but because of the personal qualities which they possess for leadership in the field of education. The school principal in St. Louis is expected (1) to direct all supervisory activities in his school, (2) to utilize efficiently and economically all materials and service supplied by the Board of Education for educational purposes, (3) to find harmonious solutions for the various problems growing out of community relations with the school, (4) to render accurate reports and keep accurate records, and to so organize and administer the school as to secure the best educational results.
>
> It is not necessarily incumbent upon the principal to be a better class room teacher than his assistants; but it is incumbent upon the principal to represent the Superintendent adequately in the local community as an administrator and supervisor of educational activities. The principal must be a leader in educational thought, competent as an organizer, and

---

[1] "Regulations of the Department of Instruction, St. Louis Public Schools," Public School Messenger, XXXI (February 1, 1934), 61-62.

[2] Official Proceedings, op. cit., XLIX (June 8, 1943), 1361-62.

> efficient in his executive actions. It is fair to say, therefore, that the principalship in St. Louis is a profession requiring scholarly attainment, and also other qualities worthy of the high responsibility with which the principal is invested.[1]

The practice of selecting principals with special qualifications both from within and without the school system was indorsed by the 1939 survey staff. The practice of allowing wide latitude to the principal and his staff was likewise commended.[2] The survey committee also pointed out that three-fourths of the principals in St. Louis were men. Their training compared favorably with those of other cities in the country, but only one-third had taken any formal study at a college in the five-year period for which data were collected. Further, one out of five of the elementary principals was sixty-five years of age or over, and the median age for the group was sixty-one. With respect to salaries, St. Louis principals in both elementary and high-schools ranked high, according to the survey, in maximum salaries established.[3]

In 1940, upon recommendation of the superintendent of instruction, the board created the position of district principal and empowered the superintendent to assign such duties to them as he deemed proper.[4] During that year eight such principals were appointed.[5] However, this position was abolished two years later and all principals holding that rank were restored to their former positions.[6]

The Teacher

In describing the first teachers in the public schools of St. Louis, Superintendent Tice held that it was a fortunate circumstance that the first teachers had been without supervision of a board of directors or any other officer charged with such duties.

---

[1] Seventy-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 23-24.

[2] Strayer, op. cit., pp. 258-59. [3] Ibid., pp. 350-52.

[4] Official Proceedings, op. cit., XLVII (September 10, 1940), 206-10.

[5] Ibid., p. 274.

[6] Ibid., XLIX (September 8, 1942), 275-83.

However, at the time of writing his First Annual Report in 1854, there were seventy-two teachers in the board's employ, some of whom he believed needed the attention and assistance from the superintendent.[1]

The scarcity of well-trained teachers constituted one of the major problems of the superintendent. He recommended two measures to relieve the situation. First, establish normal school classes during vacation for prospective teachers. Second, require applicants to join the classes in the best grammar schools and recite with them for at least three months prior to beginning their teaching.[2] The value of efficient teachers was clearly seen, and the superintendent warned the board and citizens of the community that if adequate pay were not forthcoming, St. Louis would lose some of its most efficient teachers.[3]

In the interest of keeping high qualifications for the teachers, the board employed a special agent to proceed to the eastern cities for the purpose of obtaining professionally trained teachers, since these teachers were not available in St. Louis. Obtaining well-qualified teachers was, therefore, considered to be important. In regard to this, the following statement was made in 1856:

> A prime requisite for attaining an efficient system and an elevated standard of education, is the employment of well qualified teachers. However sedulous and watchful the Board may be in guarding every other point, if there be remissness in this, the system cannot flourish nor recommend itself to public favor. Qualification for teaching must not be judged, as it too often is, by mere literary acquirements; it embraces much more: energy, force, suavity, gentleness, candor, self-control, patience; in fact, everything essential to make a good teacher, together with an unimpeachable moral character, come under and are comprehended by the term qualification.[4]

Teachers who could not create on the part of the pupils an "interest in their studies" were considered to be poor teachers and were urged by the superintendent to abandon their calling for other pursuits for which nature had perhaps better qualified them. The inefficient who were merely "time-servers and idlers" would soon be isolated and eliminated by their profession. The devoted, enthusiastic, conscientious, and faithful teachers were

---

[1] First Annual Report, op. cit., p. 2. [2] Ibid., p. 20.

[3] Ibid., p. 75. [4] Second Annual Report, op. cit., p. 27.

advised that their profession would provide greater charms and a wider field of usefulness with a consequent increase in enthusiasm for the calling.[1]

The board of directors very early in the history of the schools established rules to govern teachers. (1) Teachers were elected for a period of one year unless sooner removed by vote of a majority of the board. (2) Teachers were required to be in their respective rooms fifteen minutes prior to the opening of the morning sessions and five minutes prior to the opening of the afternoon session. Teachers failing to appear at these times were required to be reported tardy by the principal. (3) They were required to open school punctually at the appointed time, to devote themselves during school hours exclusively to the instruction of pupils, to maintain good order, and to adhere strictly to the course of study and the use of such textbooks as were prescribed by the board. (4) It was their duty to practice such discipline in their schools as would be exercised by a kind and judicious parent in his family, always firm and vigilant, yet prudent. The principles of morality and virtue, a sacred regard for truth, love of God, love of man, sobriety, industry, and frugality were to be impressed upon the minds of pupils on all proper occasions, but no teacher was to exercise any sectarian influence whatever in the schools. (5) They were charged with the duty of seeing that the pupils observed the rules laid down by the board relating to them. (6) No teacher was allowed to receive presents or valuables from the pupils and no contributions were to be taken for any purpose without consent of the superintendent. Likewise, no agent or any other person was to be permitted to exhibit any book or other apparatus except with proper consent. (7) Teachers were required to attend carefully to the ventilation and temperatures of their schoolrooms. (8) In case of any absence from school, proper notice of such absence was to be given to the superintendent. (9) Two days each year were allowed teachers for visitation. (10) Two weeks prior notice to the president of the board were required for resignations. (11) For the purpose of promoting the interest of the schools and discussing matters pertaining to the profession, teachers were required to meet once

---

[1] Third Annual Report of the General Superintendent of the St. Louis Public Schools, 1856, pp. 10-11.

each month. Programs at these sessions were in charge of the teachers.[1]

Additional rules concerning discipline were added sometime later. Teachers were required, by these rules, to maintain strict order and discipline in their classrooms at all times. Any neglect of this requirement was considered good cause for a teacher's dismissal. In maintaining the order and discipline required, teachers were authorized to employ any proper means which were considered necessary to secure compliance by the pupils, and in the use of which, teachers were promised the support of the board. In the second place, teachers were held to strict accountability as to the manner in which they used the authority delegated to them by the board in the matter of discipline, and might be subject to dismissal if the severity of punishment inflicted by them seemed unjustifiable after proper review of the case by the board. Third, at the close of each quarter of the scholastic year, each teacher was required to submit a list of all cases of corporal punishment inflicted during the quarter, giving the date, name of pupil, and cause of punishment. In the fourth place, the board offered a higher degree of appreciation and preference over all others in promotions and appointments to those teachers who proved most successful in controlling pupils without the use of corporal punishment, other qualifications being equal.[2]

After the establishment of the normal school, it became the practice to give consideration to its graduates in the filling of vacancies. In appraising the graduates of the normal school, they were considered by 1867 to be as a class, more effective, more exact, and more valuable than the teachers obtained elsewhere. Applicants for positions who came from the outside were characterized as persons who had little better claim for a position than the mere fact that they had been unsuccessful or unfortunate in everything they had previously undertaken. In many cases they came to the attention of the board simply because they were poor and needy. It became an arduous and unsatisfactory task to examine all the applicants who presented themselves.[3]

---

[1] Fifth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. xxxiv-xxxvi.

[2] Twelfth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. xxxiv-xxxv.

[3] Thirteenth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 17.

In 1872 the board was obtaining 40 per cent of its teachers from outside the city. It became necessary to establish a definite policy of employment.[1] The teachers' committee of the board of school directors served as the employment agency for many years. However, in 1872, the board established a "committee of examiners" to perform this work. By rules of the board, the superintendent, his two assistants, and the principals of the normal, high, and branch schools constituted this committee. It became their duty to examine all applicants for teaching positions in the schools, and to maintain a record of all examinations and to report to the teachers' committee concerning the same as the committee might require. The teachers who were appointed to fill vacancies were required to serve a period of probation before being appointed to permanent positions.[2]

In the employment of teachers, an effort was made to fill the vacancies with as little interruption to the routine as possible in order that the pupils could progress with as little loss of time as necessary. In the case of special teachers, for example, attempts were made to secure teachers who were qualified in two or more branches. When vacancies occurred, a teacher in the system qualified to fill the vacancy could be transferred if the outside teacher could not fill the specialist's vacancy.[3]

The board was criticized because of the practice of bringing in outside teachers. The superintendent, reporting for the school year ending in 1878, presented some information relative to the teachers in St. Louis. Of the 824 teachers employed, 595 had been educated in St. Louis schools, and 229 had not been. During the four years preceding his report, only 19 had been employed from outside the state of Missouri.[4] Several years later, the superintendent upheld the plan of securing outside teachers. He was emphatic in his belief that the selection of assistants for the high school and principals for the district schools should never be limited by any policy or rule that would confine such selections to any class of persons. He stated that the board's

---

[1] Official Proceedings, op. cit., I (May 14, 1872), 166.

[2] Nineteenth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 32.

[3] Twenty-first Annual Report, op. cit., p. 70.

[4] Twenty-fourth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 33.

policy ought to be such that the position should seek the applicant and that only the best and most suitable talent should be procured.[1] This matter was discussed again in 1883, when it was stated that,

> The theory of exclusive home patronage might be conducive of good to a community when applied to labor or to trades, but when adopted as a principle in school management there is great danger of doing much injury and wrong to the children who are to receive the instruction thus provided. It would not be right to lower the standard of qualifications in order that a sufficient number of our own people might be induced to fill vacant positions, so long as any deficiency in the number of well qualified teachers can be made up by employing persons from abroad.[2]

The board of directors employed comparatively few male teachers, since its policy was to appoint males as principals of first and second class district schools only. There were, however, a considerable number of male German teachers, and of the corps of teachers in the high school, seven were males.[3]

The lowest rank of teachers in the early district schools was that of third assistant, and the highest that of head assistant. The most experienced and successful teachers of any rank were promoted to the rank next above with a consequent raise in salary for the new rank assumed. It was the policy of the board to use second, first, and head assistants in teaching pupils of the higher grades in district schools, and second and first assistants in the lowest grade. Under this plan, the most experienced and successful teachers were used for those just entering school and those in the highest grade.[4]

All teachers entering upon the work of the district schools began as third assistants. No specified time of service was required, however, to entitle a teacher to promotion. Efficiency was the most essential characteristic necessary for promotion as vacancies occurred.[5] By 1885 there was a scarcity of qualified teachers for positions of first and head assistants in the various

---

[1] Twenty-seventh Annual Report, op. cit., p. 81.

[2] Twenty-ninth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 46-47.

[3] Eighteenth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 102.

[4] Twenty-seventh Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 61-62.

[5] Twenty-ninth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 43.

grammar departments. The board passed a resolution to open such positions to male as well as female teachers in the public schools, provided that no more than half should be so filled, and provided further, that no male person be appointed to the position of head assistant unless he had passed the principal's examination. The first and only male head assistant appointed as a result of this resolution was assigned soon afterward and after serving six months was promoted to the principalship of a small school.[1]

In the district schools, the head assistant was given the specific duty of assisting in the general supervision of the school, whenever such duty was delegated by the principal, and took charge of the school during the absence of the principal. The first and second assistants had no specific duties except in the smaller schools where the first assistant might act at times in the place of the head assistant.[2]

In the normal school and also the high school, the highest rank was that of assistant principal, the lowest that of fifth assistant. In the kindergarten, the highest rank was that of whole-day director, and the lowest, half-day paid assistant.[3]

A general salary schedule had been set up very early for all classes of teachers in the St. Louis public schools. The schedule was so graded as to pay the lowest salary to inexperienced teachers, and as experience, and responsibility of position increased, the salary was increased. The lowest salaries, therefore, were paid to the female teachers in the elementary schools.[4]

Examinations for outside teachers were held generally during the months of January and July. The examinations were both oral and written and covered the subjects of arithmetic, algebra, grammar, geography, history, and constitution of the United States, natural science, spelling, theory and methods of teaching, and reading. Applicants were required to be at least twenty years of age and not more than thirty-five, with at least two years' experience in charge of a room. In addition, satisfactory evi-

---

[1] Thirty-second Annual Report of the Board of President and Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, 1886, p. 16.

[2] Forty-first Annual Report of the Board of President and Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, 1895, pp. 29-30.

[3] Thirty-eighth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 39.

[4] Twenty-seventh Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 61-62.

dence of having been educated in a good literary institution of learning or its equivalent, was required.

Examinations of applicants for positions as principal of a district school or assistant in the high school were held twice each year, given usually during the months of January and July. Branches required for these examinations were: algebra, geometry, Latin, English literature, history and grammar of the English language, general history, natural science, and theory and history of education. An oral examination was given upon the common English branches.[1]

Little had been said prior to 1896 with respect to the differences in the qualifications of teachers for elementary and high schools. In that year, some attention was given to a discussion of the specialized nature of high-school teaching. It was pointed out that a new policy concerning the appointment of teachers of the leading subjects in high schools was needed. In the field of science in particular, teachers needed to have much general information and in addition, special preparation in the subject to be taught.[2] In 1900 the board adopted a new policy in the method of selection and appointment of high-school teachers. Prior to that time, head assistants in the grammar schools, who proved particularly good, were generally given high-school positions. Under the new policy, the board hired only college graduates for high-school teaching positions.[3]

Another change made in 1900 concerned the ranking of teachers. By a recommendation of the committee on instruction, the position of third assistant in the district schools was abolished by promoting all third assistants to the rank of second assistant.[4] It was not until the school year 1913-14, however, that important changes were made in the ranking of high-school teachers. In that year, all ranks below that of first assistant were changed to second and substitute assistants instead of second,

---

[1] Thirty-fifth Annual Report of the Board of President and Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, 1889, pp. 70-71.

[2] Forty-second Annual Report of the Board of President and Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, 1896, p. 61.

[3] Forty-sixth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, 1900, p. 87.

[4] Ibid., p. 71.

third, fourth, fifth, and special assistants.[1]

The role of the teacher and her place in the operation of the school system was well defined and described by Superintendent Soldan in his report for the year ending in 1898. In the early years of existence of the public schools of St. Louis, the need for teachers was met partially by the creation of the normal school. Candidates, at first, were taken directly from the grammar schools. Requirements were then raised to where only high-school graduates were admitted. High-school students desiring to teach pursued a special program and spent the fifth year in apprentice teaching. Following the year of apprentice teaching, the candidate served a period of substituting during which time the school officials examined the work of the teacher for the purpose of judging as to the wisdom of employing her as a regular teacher.[2] Soldan described the role of the teacher under the following categories: (1) teachers duties, (2) teacher and child, (3) order, (4) teacher's duty towards the school, (6) relations with other teachers, and (7) teacher and principal.

The teacher was expected to bear in mind that "The welfare of the child shall be the highest law." It was clear, therefore, that the schools were not considered to exist for the benefit of teacher or any other school official. In her conduct in the school or the community, she was expected to keep clear that concept as being her highest duty.

The right of the teacher to manage the pupils was conceived to be a delegated one. The child in school found her as a substitute for the parents. The board made it her duty "to practice such discipline as would be exercised by a kind and judicious parent in his family." While the teacher was expected to be sympathetic with the children, this did not mean a display through words or pampering. A nagging, scolding, morose, faultfinding, or habitually discontented teacher was considered a calamity to a school and a misfortune in the school system.

Teachers were urged to carry on a program of constant self-improvement and growth to maintain professional excellence. Regular reading of professional magazines, attendance, and participa-

---

[1] Sixtieth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, 1914, p. 47.

[2] Forty-fourth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 60-63.

tion in educational meetings were encouraged. Strong character, personal habits of neatness, good taste, and social and ethical refinement were thought to be as essential to the teacher as physical health, good hearing, and eyesight.

In her instructional duties, lessons were to be used for the development of character and mental power on the part of the pupils. The reciting of lessons in a verbatim manner was considered an obsolete practice. Recitation periods were to be used by the teacher to train the power of observation of the pupil and to incite him to further profitable activity.

Since the child's education should assist him to become a law-abiding citizen, the teacher's duty was to see that he obeyed the law and respected the rights of others. Therefore, only through rational and complete control of her room could the teacher set up the best conditions for realization of that end. The teacher was urged to respect the child's father and mother. In thus maintaining the child's respect for his parents, the teacher was expected to gain additional respect for herself. The job of educating the children was considered the joint responsibility of the teacher and parents.

In discussing the teacher's duty to the school, the superintendent stated that unswerving loyalty and full support would be expected. To accomplish the purpose of education, the teacher would devote untiring efforts to make the pupils more intelligent citizens and good men and women. A teacher's efficiency was not considered at its best unless she maintained a fervent belief in the power of the public school for good.

In her relations with other employees of the system, the teacher was expected to maintain a willing spirit of helpful co-operation. To accomplish this, such essential qualities as subordination, self-discipline, and active loyalty were considered requisites. A quality required of all St. Louis teachers was fitness for co-operative work. Through co-operative work, the profession of teaching would achieve its purpose.

The loyalty of the teacher to the school was also expected to find expression in her relation to the principal, the representative of the board. It was considered her duty to be loyal to him both in name and in fact. A teacher's professional strength was judged, in part, by the support she accorded the principal. While the teacher was to feel free to discuss frankly with the

principal matters or affairs of the school which concerned her, she had also the duty of doing it in a friendly fashion.

As a reward for merit, it was stated that a teacher's tenure of office in the city of St. Louis was absolutely secure. Efficiency was the only requirement to hold the tenure. Since the board had adopted a policy of making appointments upon the basis of merit and fitness, teachers were assured that no unjustified dismissals would be effected.[1]

Recent Changes

The system of ranking teachers which had begun with the earliest schools was continued with some modifications from time to time until 1943. On July 13, 1943, this system was radically changed. The old ranks were abolished together with the salary schedule then in vogue. Under the new system, teachers were paid on one of five schedules according to status, length of service, and training. Schedule 1, the lowest in the salary scale called for a beginning salary of $1,200 and increased to $2,000 during the ninth year. Schedule 5, the highest in the scale, started at $5,000 and reached the maximum of $6,000 at the fifth year. The beginning scale applied to elementary, high-school, and college teachers and the highest scale applied to high-school principals, principals of technical high-schools and teachers colleges, and to directors of education.[2]

The problem of adequate care for old and needy teachers appeared very early in the history of the schools. Repeated efforts of the teachers and the board of education to secure an adequate retirement bill proved unsuccessful. This problem was recognized by Superintendent Blewett in 1916 when he said,

> Among the teachers in the corps of any large school system there are always some who, in spite of industry and prudence, fall under crushing financial distress during their service or subsequent to it. And this condition is frequently caused by the teacher's sacrifice of self for others in her family.
>
> There are also some of unusual talent and ambition whose family obligations and limited means shut them out from the opportunities and benefits of the higher professional training

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 69-96.

[2] Official Proceedings, op. cit., L (July 13, 1943), 119-22.

> for which they are capable and which they earnestly desire.
> It is to the best interest of the school system that provision be made to relieve such distress and to open opportunity to such ambition. The Board of Education of the City of St. Louis has never been indifferent to cases of distress or of cramped opportunity, but it has no authority under the law to aid such cases by money from school funds. If relief is to come, it must come from individual benevolence.[1]

Because of Blewett's deep concern for this matter, he established a foundation in trust to a board of trustees known as "The Board of Trustees of the St. Louis Public Schools Foundation for the Relief of Distress and for the Advancement of Professional Training," and subscribed fifty thousand dollars as a memorial to his wife and her parents to be known as "The Jessie Parsons Blewett Fund." The foundation provided that only the income from the fund should be used.[2] Later, the sisters of Superintendent Blewett donated the sum of $15,000 known as "The Ben Blewett Fund."[3] For the year ending December 31, 1944, the total book value of all these funds amounted to $510,082.52.[4]

The passage of the retirement bill for St. Louis described in an earlier chapter was described as the most significant advance in teacher, employee, and pupil welfare in the history of the St. Louis public schools. It represented the culmination of many years of effort in securing a joint contributory plan for the orderly termination of service by age from the system thus providing a greater degree of security than the teachers had ever possessed.[5] Adding to the security measures for the teaching personnel was the passage of a law providing for tenure. The law defines clearly the conditions of tenure and definitely fixes termination of service at the age of seventy years.[6]

---

[1] Sixty-third Annual Report, op. cit., p. 665.

[2] Ibid., p. 666.

[3] Sixty-sixth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, 1920, p. 615.

[4] Ninetieth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 319.

[5] Eighty-ninth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, 1943, p. 12.

[6] Ibid., p. 13.

Other Educational Functionaries

The duties and functions assigned to the assistant superintendent, the school principal, and the teacher have been described in an attempt to show the part each has played in providing public education for the children of St. Louis. Other educational functionaries have contributed to the growth and development of the public schools. Among these have been the truant officer, the medical adviser, director of the psycho-educational clinic, director of vocational counseling, directors of the various divisions, and the directors of education. The duties of each of these will be discussed briefly.

Truant officer.--With the passage of the compulsory education law, it became necessary to establish machinery to accomplish the purposes for which the legislation was enacted, namely, the guarantee of the rudiments of an education to all the children of the city. The board began to take introductory steps soon after its passage to carry out the law. A truant officer and four assistants were appointed. The first duty assigned to this official and his assistants was the matter of educating the derelict parents by insisting on the fulfillment of their duty to send children to school. In the second place, an attempt was made to spread information concerning the provisions of the law among parents and employers.[1] Rules of the board were established to provide a basis for the proper functioning of the truant officer. He was placed under the jurisdiction of the superintendent of instruction and directed to carry out the law relating to compulsory attendance and such other duties as might be assigned to him by the superintendent. He was further directed to submit such reports concerning his duties as the superintendent might require. He was prohibited from other outside work and required to observe stated office hours.[2] An appraisal of the work of the truant officer during the first year of his appointment was favorable. The first year was used in an educational campaign for parents and employers of labor. It was reported that forcible measures were used only when persuasion had failed. The police department of the city was praised for the efficient co-operation

---

[1] Fifty-first Annual Report, op. cit., p. 29.

[2] Ibid., p. 269.

given in carrying out the provisions of the law.[1]

In October, 1906 the number of assistants to the truant officer was increased from four to five, and in 1908 to ten. The department was given credit for making a substantial increase in school enrollment, in the average number of days attended, and in the regularity of attendance. The number of children committed to the industrial school because of continued offenses against the law or school regulations was considerably less than before the position of truant officer was created.[2]

Medical adviser.--When the board of education established special rooms and schools for the mentally and physically handicapped children, the need of professional advice from a physician became evident. Only pupils who were incapable of making satisfactory progress in the ordinary schools were to be placed in the special schools, but the board considered it highly important that all such handicapped cases be accurately identified. Superintendent Soldan recommended the appointment of Dr. James Stewart as medical adviser. He was assigned to this office and directed to examine all cases recommended for special schools and to assist in the selection of proper buildings for the schools. In selecting children for these schools he consulted with the parents, where possible, for obtaining consent for the transfer, and to obtain the family history of the child. He also advised the parents in regard to the proper care and treatment of these children.[3]

In addition to examining pupils, who in the opinions of principals and teachers were in need of medical attention, the medical adviser, under the direction of the superintendent, visited other schools for the purpose of inspecting their sanitary conditions. It was necessary for the medical adviser to revisit schools in the crowded areas for the purpose of improving sanitary conditions.[4]

Shortly after the creation of the position of medical

---

[1] Fifty-second Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, 1906, p. 15.

[2] Fifty-seventh Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, 1911, p. 131.

[3] Fifty-fourth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 239-40.

[4] Ibid., p. 263.

adviser, rules were adopted governing his functions. He was placed under the control and direction of the superintendent of instruction. (1) The medical adviser was directed to keep such office hours and tender such reports as the superintendent might prescribe. (2) He was required to devote his whole time during the sessions of the schools in visiting the same, except when required by the superintendent to assist him in other duties. Reports in writing were required concerning school inspections and recommendations for improvement of sanitary interests. (3) He was directed to inspect the conditions of light and ventilation in the various schoolrooms and the heating of the schools. His observations and suggestions concerning appliances of the buildings and the practices of instruction in sanitary matters were to be reported to the superintendent. (4) He was authorized to instruct teachers individually or in such meetings as the superintendent might call, regarding the best ways of conducting elementary tests of the eyes and ears of the pupils. It was also his duty to inspect new plans of schoolhouses or improvements and additions, in order to observe whether they were in accordance with proper sanitary conditions. (5) In case of epidemics or accidents, he was required to render medical advice and give such assistance as the superintendent might direct, provided however, that he did not undertake the treatment of diseases in cases coming to his notice through his connection with the public schools. (6) He was given power under the authority of the commissioner of school buildings to give instructions to janitors in all matters appertaining to the health of the pupils and teachers, and the sanitary conditions of the buildings.[1]

The board of education on February 9, 1909, adopted a resolution creating the department of school hygiene under the department of instruction. Rules were adopted which defined the functions of the department as the discovering of physical defects and communicable diseases which interfered with efficient work among the children in the public schools, the reporting of these defects to the parents concerned together with the advice that the family physician be consulted, and the control of communicable diseases. The superintendent of instruction was given the author-

---

[1] Fifty-fifth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, 1909, p. 180.

ity to appoint for this work, a supervisor of hygiene, and as many inspectors of hygiene as the board from time to time determined. The duties and functions of these officials were defined by the board.

The medical adviser was therefore supplanted by the supervisor of hygiene, and the individual who had served as medical adviser became the supervisor of the department of hygiene.[1]

Director of psycho-educational clinic.--After the board of education had established schools especially planned for the education of subnormal children, the matter of securing trained personnel to carry on these schools became a distinct problem. The need of a trained specialist to direct the work was pointed out by the superintendent. Upon his recommendation, the board created the position of director of the psycho-educational clinic. His duties were to examine and report upon cases of abnormal children, supervise the special schools for individual instruction, instruct teachers for the special classes, and investigate the needs of and make suggestions on the course of study for abnormal pupils.[2] The duties of the director were redefined by the superintendent in 1916 as follows: (1) the nomination of teachers for special schools; (2) the recommending of new supplies; (3) the reviewing of supervisors' marking of teachers; (4) advising the superintendent and the board regarding the work of the special schools and the needs of mentally abnormal pupils, and (5) administration of the special schools.[3]

Upon the recommendation of the superintendent of instruction, the division of psycho-educational clinic was renamed the division of tests and measurements with the same positions and salaries which obtained under the former division. Thus the director of the psycho-educational clinic became the director of the division of tests and measurements.[4]

Director of vocational counseling.--The matter of vocational counseling had occupied the attention of the instruction de-

---

[1] Official Proceedings, op. cit., XV (February 9, 1909), 1215-16.

[2] Sixtieth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 157-58.

[3] Sixty-third Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 190-91.

[4] Official Proceedings, op. cit., XXVIII (July 12, 1921), 101.

partment for some years prior to 1924. The attendance department had attempted to give some advice in the matters of schooling and employment, but no definite organization had existed for counseling. The superintendent of instruction, therefore, recommended on September 9, 1924, that the board create in the department of instruction a division of vocational counseling, under the supervision of a director, for the purpose of directing the work of vocational counseling throughout the school system. The board of education approved his recommendation and the division was established.[1]

Four principal functions were assigned the division, namely: (1) counseling, (2) issuing certificate permits to those between fourteen and sixteen years of age; (3) placement; and (4) industrial investigation. The director reported that during the first year of operation, the division had issued 3,405 work permits, reissued 2,772 to permit change of employment, and granted 5,534 renewals permitting children to continue work after expiration of permits. In addition, more than 4,000 children had been referred to positions and 1,337 had been placed. He further reported that industrial and commercial concerns were showing definite signs of interest in the service provided.[2]

Directors of divisions.--The superintendent's reorganization in 1926, as mentioned earlier in this study, reduced the number of assistant superintendents from six to three and increased the number of directors of divisions from four to nine. This was done to improve the quality of service which the administration was rendering to the public schools. In making the reorganization, the superintendent of instruction listed twelve "underlying principles" of educational administration.

> 1. The aim of any school organization is to secure maximum educational efficiency with a minimum expenditure of funds.
> 2. The functioning point in any school system is the classroom; and all positions in the system must be justified by their improvement of the educational contact between teacher and pupils.
> 3. The principal in charge of a school is individually responsible for the success of the school and the proper use

---

[1] Ibid., XXXI (September 9, 1924), 209-13.

[2] Seventy-second Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, 1926, pp. 50-53.

of all provisions made by the Board of Education for the benefit of the school.

4. The Superintendent is individually responsible to the Board of Education for all school policies and for the exercise of authority vested in him as the Board's officer.

5. Responsibility for every act and transaction performed under the Superintendent's direction and authority must be definitely placed.

6. The effective functioning of administrative or supervisory action in a school system requires much voluntary cooperation, thereby necessitating direct communications and contacts unhampered by the delays of formality.

7. A school system must be built upon a definite recognition of individual differences and community variations so as to avoid the deadly effect of uniformity and lockstep procedure.

8. The growing professionalization of both principals and teachers should be recognized by increasing proportionately their responsibility and their opportunity to exercise initiative.

9. Every response to an administrative or supervisory problem should be determined scientifically by a study of all pertinent facts.

10. It is through the enlightened understanding and morale of the public and the teaching corps rather than dictatorial authority that the successful installation and execution of policies must be secured.

11. Inherent evidence of faith in each individual worker should characterize the organization.

12. Automatic performance of all routine acts of administration should be provided by the organization so that the superintendent may give his major attention to problems of policy and to progressive movements in education.[1]

The policy of creating new divisions to care for special needs of the schools began in 1907 with the creation of the attendance division. This was followed by the creation of the division of hygiene in 1909, the division of tests and measurements in 1914, and the division of vocational counseling in 1924. By 1926 the superintendent recognized certain other well-defined specialized responsibilities devolving upon the superintendent, which in his opinion, justified the creation of five additional divisions, each with a director, to be known as (1) division of housing and fixed equipment, (2) division of curriculum, books, and supplies, (3) division of personnel, (4) division of records and statistics, and (5) division of school and community relations.[2]

Each director of a division was expected to maintain direct and informal contact with the various school principals and

---

[1] Seventy-third Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 13-14.

[2] Ibid., pp. 15-16.

directors of other divisions. He was expected to secure action and improvement of service through co-operation, and was expected to consider himself as the head of a service bureau for the schools. The superintendent expected to be aided in a twofold way by each director: (1) in accordance with predetermined policy, the director was expected to perform the many routine acts of administration which the superintendent found it impossible personally to perform; and, (2) to investigate fully for the superintendent all new problems pertaining to their work, including participation in research problems in special fields, and to place before him all the facts for consideration in determination of school policy. Thus, research became a definite function of every specialized division.[1]

To govern the activities of the various directors of divisions, definite regulations were formulated. Each director of a division in the department of instruction was made responsible to the superintendent for the successful performance of all duties assigned the division. In the performance of these duties, each director was required to follow policies predetermined and approved by the superintendent. The general duties of the director in each division were listed as follows:

> 1. To reply directly to all inquiries addressed or referred to him and to cause to be filed daily with the Superintendent's secretary all carbons of his official correspondence.
> 2. To direct and supervise the work of his assistants and clerks.
> 3. To make all reports required by the Superintendent concerning the work of the division.
> 4. To interview all principals, teachers, patrons, or other persons concerned about the performance of the duties for which his division is responsible.
> 5. To prepare promptly and in correct form all items required by the Superintendent for his approval or for the Board of Education; and to submit such items in ample time for review.
> 6. To report to the Superintendent all changes needed in administrative policy with respect to the particular functions of the division concerned.
> 7. To pursue research studies relating to the work of his division; to base all of his work upon as complete objective data as it was possible for him to assemble; and to present with each report or recommendation an adequate abstract of these data.[2]

In addition to the general regulations, specific duties were out-

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 18-19.

[2] Ibid., p. 19.

lined in detail for each of the nine divisions.

Beginning with the year ending in 1932, the number of divisions was reduced. For that year, the division of curriculum, books, and equipment was not listed in the report.[1] For 1934 only six divisions were listed,[2] and for 1937, five.[3] For the year 1940 the number had again risen to six[4] as a result of the Strayer survey which recommended that a personnel department be added.[5] The addition of the division of instruction and curriculum for the year ending 1942, again increased the number to seven.[6]

Directors of education.--Under the plan of reorganization for the instruction department initiated by the present incumbent, Superintendent Hickey, the position of district superintendent was abolished and the rank of director of education was created.[7] The report for the year ending 1943, listed three such positions.[8] The creation of this office enabled the department of instruction to carry on its many involved functions, some of which do not always involve strictly educational operations. Further, the directors of education play a part in co-ordinating the activities previously carried on without adequate direction.[9]

By 1944 the instruction department divisions of personnel, hygiene, tests and measurements, attendance, physical education, and recreation were brought under an assistant superintendent of instruction and designated as a teacher and pupil personnel division.[10] The various assistant superintendents had at their dis-

---

[1] Seventy-eighth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, 1932, p. 14.

[2] Eightieth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 54.

[3] Eighty-third Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, 1937, p. 34.

[4] Eighty-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 24.

[5] Ibid., p. 20.

[6] Eighty-eighth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 18.

[7] Official Proceedings, op. cit., XLIX (October 13, 1942), 384-94.

[8] Eighty-ninth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 72.

[9] Official Proceedings, op. cit., L (September 12, 1944), 264-68.

[10] Ninetieth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 14.

posal in carrying out their duties, the services of the directors of education. At the present time, the duties of the directors have not been listed in printed form.

In addition to the various intermediate functionaries described, the schools have had the benefits of a large number of supervisors. The matter of supervision is discussed in a separate chapter of this study.

Teachers' Organizations

In a discussion of the development of a professional staff, it is appropriate to mention some of the teachers' organizations that have grown out of teacher interests and activities. Very early in the history of the schools, a Teachers' Association was formed. This association had the strong support of the board of directors and served for the training of many of the new teachers. In summarizing the activities for the year ending 1859-60, the following statement was issued:

> It is not necessary to speak of our exercises much in detail. The programme adopted at the first meeting has been very closely followed. In the ten meetings, we have had twenty-three written exercises. In four of the meetings, forty minutes of each have been devoted to the discussion of practical questions, by persons previously appointed, and one question has been before us for general discussion. There have been two class exercises in geography, conducted by Mr. Edwards, and two in clausal analysis of the Paradise Lost--one conducted by Mr. Metcalf; and one by Mr. Childs. Five exercises in reading have been presented by ladies. Capt. Hammersley favored us with a pleasing address containing valuable thoughts on physical education. We have had communications on penmanship from Messrs. Spencer, sen. and jun., and Mr. Lusk. Under the direction of the Association, six valuable lectures on human physiology were delivered in the hall of the High School building, by Dr. Paddock. And these meetings have afforded opportunity for the School Board and Superintendent to make necessary communications to the teachers.[1]

Another association important to teachers was the Pedagogical Society. Meetings were held on Saturday twice each month at which times the group divided into sections, each led by a competent lecturer or teacher. The subjects discussed were: pedagogical, literary, and philosophical. The study of languages was also included as a part of the group's activity, and a section was

---

[1] Sixth Annual Report, op. cit., p. xxv.

formed for a discussion of pedagogical questions.[1]

The first organization among the teachers for purely welfare purposes was the Mutual Aid Association. The purpose of this organization was to furnish financial aid in cases of sickness. In event of death, it paid a fixed sum sufficient to defray funeral expenses.[2] Several years after the formation of this group, the Teachers' Annuity Association was formed. The purposes of this organization was to provide a benefit for superannuated or disabled teachers, matters which could not lawfully be taken care of by the school system itself. Each teacher belonging to the association contributed annually 1 per cent of her salary. Their funds were increased from time to time by a number of entertainments and festivals given for that purpose. By 1903 the amount in the fund had accumulated after four years to $49,059.75 and ten superannuated teachers were receiving annuities.[3]

The Froebel Society was organized for the purpose of creating a better understanding of his methods and principles of education thereby advancing the interest of the St. Louis kindergartens. By 1905 the membership in this organization had grown to four hundred and was open to mothers as well as teachers and others interested in the work of the organization.[4]

Some of the other organizations formed for study and self-improvement were: Teachers' Fellowship Society, Principals' Association, St. Louis Grade Teachers Association, Schoolmasters' Club, Men's Club of High School Teachers, Harris Teachers College Club Alumnae Association, Phi Delta Kappa Chapter of St. Louis, Principals' Club, and High School Teachers Association.[5] These organizations grew out of a desire for improvement in service and general educational betterment and many of them are still active in promoting these objectives.

---

[1] Forty-ninth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 236.

[2] Ibid., p. 237.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Fifty-first Annual Report, op. cit., p. 175.

[5] Sixty-seventh Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 186-88.

CHAPTER V

GROWTH OF VARIOUS SCHOOL DIVISIONS

In any system of public schools, the kinds of educational opportunities offered depends very largely upon the type of schools provided by the community and the organization of materials in the courses offered within the schools. The public schools first organized in St. Louis were the district schools which correspond to what is known today as elementary schools. However, as the city and the advantages of education became known to the community, the educational opportunities were extended.

In the extension, kindergartens, high schools, normal schools, special schools, vocational and technical schools appeared. The provision of educational opportunities for members of the colored race also came to be recognized as the duty of the community. The growth of the school divisions provides the subject matter for this chapter.

The development of the course of study has been studied and previously reported.[1] Only those aspects of the course of study, necessary for a discussion of the various extensions will be dealt with in this study.

Elementary Schools

The first public schools organized in St. Louis were elementary (district) schools and opened their doors to the pupils on April of 1838. Miss Mary H. Salisbury and David Armstrong were elected to teach in School No. 1 and Mr. Edward Leavy and Miss Sarah Hardy as teachers in School No. 2. These schools had been erected by the board for the specific purpose of providing the rudiments of education to the children.[2]

---

[1] Douglas E. Lawson, Curriculum Development in City School Systems. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Education, University of Chicago. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1940.

[2] First Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 52-53.

School No. 3 was opened on the first Monday in January, 1842, on a location purchased by the board and upon which a school had been built by the board at a cost of approximately $11,000.00.[1] At a meeting of the board on June 27, 1843, a resolution was passed establishing a primary male and female school in the First and Sixth Wards, provided the citizens donated to the board sufficient means to defray rent and fuel. These schools were opened on July 24, 1843.[2] Plans were made to procure lots and erect schoolhouses to replace the rented quarters. Until 1848 the various district schools were known by numbers, but in that year they were given names. Names were chosen, for the most part, to honor some of the prominent early citizens of St. Louis.[3] On August 28, 1857, the city was divided into attendance districts for the first time. Children living within a given district were required to attend the school within that district unless there were good reasons for transferring elsewhere.[4]

The growth of the early district schools was phenomenal. For the school year ending in 1856, there were nineteen houses in use for school purposes, containing a total of forty-five departments consisting of twenty-three primary, nineteen grammar, one high, one intermediate, and one mixed grammar and primary.[5] During the period 1857 to 1860, eleven new schoolhouses were erected. They were located with reference to the demand for educational facilities in the different parts of the city.[6]

In spite of the tremendous growth in the number and population of the schools, many pupils who should have been in the elementary school were not there. It was estimated that only one-sixth of the children passed beyond the fourth grade of the district schools.[7] This problem existed for many years. In 1900 it was estimated that six thousand children each year left the district schools with the course of study about half finished.[8]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 358. [2] Ibid., pp. 359-60. [3] Ibid., p. 367.

[4] Fourth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 12.

[5] Third Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 43-44.

[6] Sixth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 6.

[7] Thirty-fourth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 32-33.

[8] Forty-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 21.

Remedies proposed to correct this situation were as follows: (1) provision of free textbooks to all grades in the district schools; (2) enrichment of course of study; (3) establishment of manual training high schools.[1]

Organization.--The Lancasterian, or monitorial system, was used in the first elementary schools of St. Louis. This system required a large study room and small adjoining recitation rooms. While these schools were relatively less expensive at the time of their organization, due to the fact that a "trained" principal could oversee the work of the monitors in adjacent rooms, it proved cumbersome and steps were taken to reorganize the schools.

In the erection of new buildings and the alteration of old ones, the graded system evolved. This change had the unanimous approval of the board. The system of schools to be adopted involved five principles. (1) The graded system would replace the Lancasterian plan. (2) Schoolhouses built in the future would be of uniform size throughout to meet the demands of the various districts. (3) Each school, to secure good classification and economical management, should provide for from six hundred to seven hundred pupils. (4) Scholars who would pursue the same studies and be equally advanced should be allotted to the teacher. (5) There should be but one principal teacher, and one organization for each building.[2]

By 1860 four-fifths of the schools were operating on the graded system. Substantial improvements were effected through the change. The labors and responsibilities of the teachers were better distributed and the efficiency of instruction improved. Under the Lancasterian system, several departments had existed in the same schools, while under the graded system they were consolidated into one organization. Instead of an average of 130 pupils to each department under the old arrangement, 300 could be accommodated under the new. The large number assigned to each department resulted in economy by lowering the per capita cost of instruction.[3] By 1860 the district school contained primary rooms, intermediate rooms, and grammar rooms, each made up of two grades.[4]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 30-31. [2] Fifth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 26.

[3] Sixth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 8.

[4] Ibid., p. xiv.

The Franklin School had not, by 1860, been graded. To indicate the cumbersome plan of its organization, the following description is included:

> The house was erected in 1857, and the first school was opened in it the 25th of January following. The first grammar department was opened in Feb. 1858; the second primary in March 1858; the intermediate in Sept. 1858; and the second grammar in Feb. 1859. The instruction in all these departments is generally efficient and satisfactory, so is the discipline in each when the scholars are in their respective rooms; but there seems to be a lack of order and system in opening and closing the school sessions, and in the movements of the pupils in going out and coming in at recesses and intermissions. These irregularities and causes of complaint, spring directly from the improper construction of the building and the plurality and independency of the departments. It is not one school, but five, having five independent organizations, five principals, five different methods of discipline and government, &c. It is not to be expected that a school so organized will work smoothly in all details. Making some allowance for these facts, the management and discipline are in a satisfactory condition.[1]

Superintendent Divoll held steadfast to his belief in the graded system. By 1861 the separate organizations had been reduced from forty-seven to thirty-two in spite of the fact that attendance had increased from 5,814 to 8,098. His idea was to continue reorganization until each unit contained from four hundred to five hundred students.[2] He believed that children of ordinary capacity, without being overtaxed and under good conditions, could pass through the district school course in seven years, or twenty-eight quarters. In pursuing that plan, he stated that a teacher's pupils should be divided into two classes in the first, second, and third grades; and into possibly as many as four classes in grades four through seven.[3]

At a meeting of superintendents of the western cities held in November, 1873, it was agreed that a system be adopted which would embody eight grades for the work of the district schools. Each grade, under the plan, corresponded to a year's work and was subdivided into quarters. The cities of Toledo, Cleveland, Detroit, Cincinnati, Memphis, Chicago, and St. Louis adopted the

---

[1] Ibid., p. 31.

[2] Seventh and Eighth Annual Reports, op. cit., p. 8.

[3] Ninth and Tenth Annual Reports of the Board of Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, 1863, 1864, pp. 64-65.

system.[1]

District schools were classified according to the number of regular assistants to which they were entitled. The number of assistants was determined by the quota of pupils belonging. The grades to which the pupils belonged did not affect the classification of the school. Those having eighteen or more regular assistants ranked as first-class; thirteen and not more than seventeen, as second-class; ten and not more than twelve, as third-class; eight or nine assistants, as fourth-class; five, six, or seven, as fifth-class; four or five, as sixth-class; less than four, as seventh-class. Schools in sparsely settled districts were classified slightly differently.[2]

Coeducation.--Prior to 1858 the sexes had been entirely separated in the grammar schools. Only in the primary schools and in the high school had the experiment of coeducation been started. During that year the Franklin school was opened as a mixed school. Following that, each of the grammar schools with one exception had been reorganized by 1873 to receive both sexes into the same rooms and classes.[3]

The coeducation of the sexes was discussed by Harris in 1870. He felt that the plan of coeducation had been approved both in theory and practice. He held that the plan was definitely advantageous and listed four reasons. (1) By having rooms and classes open to all, definite economy could be secured since better classification could be effected and larger classes accommodated. (2) Discipline was better in mixed schools. The rudeness and abandon among the boys, which had prevailed, gave way to self-restraint in the presence of girls. (3) Instruction was improved. The mixed schools took on a healthier tone. (4) Individual development was more sound and healthy. Boys and girls both in daily association within the classes seemed to develop a "quiet self-possession."[4]

The district school became a distinct organization for

---

[1] Nineteenth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 26.

[2] Thirty-second Annual Report, op. cit., p. 41.

[3] Nineteenth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 105.

[4] Sixteenth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 17-21.

the purpose of training both boys and girls below the high school. Each of the schools, even though housed in more than one building, was under the supervision of a principal who was made responsible for the internal government of the school, including all classes held therein. Each school was located in a definite territory and all the pupils living within that territory were required to attend the school--unless, for good reasons, the superintendent directed otherwise.

School sessions were held on each week day except Saturdays during the school year. The school year continued from the first Monday in September for forty consecutive weeks, exclusive of holidays. Each school year was divided into four terms of ten weeks each. Each day began at nine o'clock in the morning and closed at three twenty-five in the afternoon with an interval for lunch.[1]

Classification and promotion.--The matter of "uniformity" received attention very early in the history of the St. Louis public schools. In 1856 it was stated that the school system was based upon the idea of uniformity in all the schools. The number of teachers under which each pupil studied prior to his reaching high school was six. If each teacher had been permitted to employ his or her own method, or no method at all, the result would have been one of chaos and confusion. To avoid these evils, it was determined in St. Louis that an experiment be made of having a uniform system in order that pupils might move from one part of the city to another, or from one teacher to another, without detriment to progress and without losing the mental training which had been imparted.[2]

The internal organization, discussed elsewhere, also concerned this matter of uniformity. As far as possible, each teacher's pupils were divided into two classes in the first three grades and into as many as four classes in the four upper grades.[3]

The plan of quarterly promotion became the pattern for the early district schools. No class was permitted to leave the studies assigned to any given quarter until they had been thor-

---

[1] Fiftieth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 78.

[2] Third Annual Report, op. cit., p. 13.

[3] Ninth and Tenth Annual Reports, op. cit., p. 65.

oughly mastered, so in reality there were occasions when more than one quarter was needed to do the work generally assigned for the period. Entry into the work assigned to the new quarter was possible at any time within the year. As far as practicable, promotions were made by class at the close of the quarter, but particularly capable pupils could be promoted irrespective of their classes.[1]

The theory of the promotional plan was discussed in detail by Harris in his Fifteenth Annual Report, as follows:

1. He held that great differences existed among pupils in their capacity to learn. Children of eight were believed to be able to make far greater progress than five-year olds in primary work. Bright children could make far more rapid progress than those of the stolid and dull type.

2. Schools should provide for differences in childrens' capacities to learn by frequent reclassification. This would prevent the schools from becoming lifeless machines--"procrustean beds." Bright pupils would become careless in habits of study, and slow pupils demoralized through being pushed.

3. Great differences existed in regard to amount and regularity of school attendance. The accession and loss of pupils in the schools during the year approximated 50 per cent or one-half the number belonging.

4. Promotions made once every ten weeks were considered sufficient to keep the school in a state of equilibrium. Children progressing at different rates could, therefore, be placed at the proper level and the proper quota maintained.

5. Promotions should not be made by classes. By placing pupils in groups of equal attainment, all classes would then be made up of fair, average, and poor scholars. At times, the average and fair scholars would be stimulated by being the best in the class. The poor ones would experience some satisfaction in being the middle group.

6. Classification should never be absolute within a given school. In dividing pupils into classes, the proper number in the class should first be considered and second, the qualifications. In the upper grades, the chances for proper grading were not so good as in the lowest grades. The remedy suggested was bringing

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 63-66.

together the pupils of the higher grades into fewer schools.

7. The practice of frequent transfer of pupils as opposed to yearly class promotions made it possible to maintain the size of the upper-grade classes. Since, in general, these were taught by the most experienced and higher-priced teachers, such a policy could be justified. At the same time, the poorer class of teachers had their burdens lightened.

8. A frequent transfer of pupils was not considered to be detrimental since any pupil usually would be transferred only once each year. The system discarded one general epoch of transfer and reclassification at the close of the year, and adopted in its place four or more partial transfers designed to accommodate the twofold demand: (a) that the ablest and highest-paid teachers have, at all times, their full quota of pupils; (b) that the ablest pupils make steady progress instead of being held back.

9. The school process was interpreted as being a process of continual readjustment and adaptation to the wants of the organization and the capacities of the pupils. Stimulation was to be achieved by moving upwards. The "injury" from dropping to the class below could be very largely avoided through a sifting upward.

10. Central schools were advocated to absorb the fewer pupils in the upper grades, leaving to the other schools only such grades as could be provided with good classification.

11. The lack of elasticity in the promotion from district schools to the high school was deplored. Pupils delayed through sickness, poverty, or "inactive temperaments" were forced to fall back a year or in a vain endeavor to make up their deficient work, subject themselves to discouragement.

12. The effects accruing from reclassification were considered advantageous from the standpoints of both economy and rapid progress.[1]

Several years later the district schools were described as follows:

> In the schools of St. Louis there are, in each room, at least two classes, in some instances three, representing different quarters of a grade or different grades. These classes recite alternately, and each in turn is engaged in study or seat work. The two classes, while they differ in grade, and

---

[1] Nineteenth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 24-29.

> are doing independent work, are not separated by an interval of a year's work, but are near each other in grading, being perhaps a quarter, or, in the lower grades, frequently only half a quarter removed from each other. In consequence there are in each large school, especially in the lower and middle grades, classes of almost every stage of progress. Not only every grade but almost every quarter of a grade is represented by some class, at almost any time of the year. Any child newly admitted is sure to find not only his grade or year's work, but in most cases a class doing the work of the quarter at which he stopped in his former school. In the old method of classification each class or room is separated, as a rule, from the class above or below by the interval of a year's work. In the schools of St. Louis, as in many other cities, the interval between a class and the one above or below it, is from a half quarter in the lowest grade, to a half year in the highest. The interval is greater in the latter, because the smaller number of children in the higher grades makes shorter intervals impracticable.[1]

The plan of promotion, according to an investigation reported for the school year ending 1899, indicated that there was little or no retardation in the upper grades. In other words, in the higher grades, each year's work was done by the average child in less than a year's time, where in many cases in the lower grades more than a year's time was required. With regard to retention, the plan by this time seemed to favor the promotion of certain backward pupils to keep them within the group which corresponded roughly to their ages. Unreasonable delays in promotion of slow children were considered reprehensible.[2]

The report of the St. Louis survey in 1918 commended the St. Louis plan of the quarter system. The plan was described as being unique throughout the country and was considered to be accomplishing in a large way the major purpose of advancing the children regularly through the work of the successive grades.[3]

The survey report for 1939, found the quarterly plan of promotion to be an undesirable one. This report held that the quarterly plan of promotion, adopted more than a half century ago, had been based on assumptions which scientific studies in education have proved unsound. It was reported that many of the individual schools in St. Louis had abandoned the quarterly plan except as an administrative device.[4] The present plan provides for

---

[1] Forty-fifth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 86-87.

[2] Ibid., p. 109. [3] Judd, op. cit., II, 17-18.

[4] Strayer, op. cit., pp. 20-21.

semiannual promotions.

Ungraded rooms.--The idea of an ungraded room in the elementary schools for pupils whose progress differed greatly from the group was discussed as early as 1899. Where the number of pupils did not justify the creation of a special room, a small group located with a small graded group was suggested.[1] Ungraded rooms were developed for students not evenly advanced in the several studies and it was reported as successful.[2]

Children were at first somewhat skeptical of the ungraded room, and were disposed to look upon the room as a "dummy" room. However, the concept of the room was soon changed so that it was regarded as a place where children were helped, and parents were reported as constantly asking that their children be placed in the room. The work of the room was given exclusively to individual instruction. Types of children assigned were overaged, oversized, or frail backward children, or those unavoidably retarded by late entrance, absence, illness, or transfer.[3] A supervisor reporting in 1915 declared that the greatest usefulness of the ungraded rooms was the aiding of children in the more advanced grades to recover a standing justified by their ages, but lost through changes, removal, ill health, or poor instruction.[4] For the year 1916-17, there was a total of fifty-one ungraded classes at the end of the year and the total number of whole-time and part-time pupils attending during the course of the year was 3,111.[5]

High Schools

Establishment.--The first high school opened its doors to pupils on the first Monday in February, 1853, with "some seventy odd" qualified pupils to attend. The high school had been organized during the winter and was placed in charge of Jeremiah D. Low, A.M., who had long been connected with the St. Louis public

---

[1] Forty-fifth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 115-16.

[2] Fifty-fourth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 110.

[3] Fifty-eighth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 188.

[4] Sixty-first Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 83-84.

[5] Sixty-fifth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, 1919, p. 102.

schools and who had qualified himself for the position through his popularity and success as a teacher.[1]

Until the new high-school building was completed and opened in January, 1856, the first high-school classes were held in the Benton school. The opening of the new high school stimulated the enrollment as evidenced by the increase in the number of students from seventy to two hundred and thirty-five four years later. Many of the students who enrolled, however, failed to graduate. From the time of its organization in 1853 to 1858, the high school had enrolled more than five hundred students, but only thirteen of that number had completed the prescribed course and received diplomas. The average length of time which high-school students attended was considerably less than two years.[2]

Functions.--Superintendent Tice was enthusiastic about the development of the high school. He reported that no event had done more to popularize the cause of popular education in St. Louis than the opening of the new high school. The rich sought admittance to the school because they felt that no institution in the country could surpass the effectiveness of the public schools. The poor sought admittance because they recognized the high school as an opportunity for putting their sons and daughters on a literary and intellectual basis with the rich.

In Tice's opinion, the high school was expected to do two things: (1) sustain the reputation of the schools and supply greater uniformity of system and method of instruction and discipline into the administration of schools; (2) furnish, to a great extent, the annual supply of teachers for the other schools. The first high school was handicapped in attaining these objectives because of the fact that it had too many pupils for the two teachers in its organization.[3]

The high school was not accepted by all members of the community as an essential part of the educational program. After the high school had been in operation for more than twenty years, some questioned the board's authority to maintain a high school at public cost. The principal of the high school, H. H. Morgan,

---

[1] First Annual Report, op. cit., p. 33.

[2] Fourth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 23-25.

[3] First Annual Report, op. cit., p. 34.

took occasion in 1877 to justify the public high school. His remarks were organized under the following headings: (1) to those who hold free public education to be an unjustifiable burden upon the state; (2) to those who believe in education as a gift and not a right; (3) to those who believe in education as a right; and, (4) the reciprocal duty of the citizen and state. He believed that the state would reap great benefits from the education of its children in the high school.[1]

Those who continued to attack the high school on the basis of expense were joined in their opposition by those who held that it was not good policy to provide for the people that which they could and should provide for themselves. It was asserted that the poor, who were in need of assistance, did not avail themselves of the opportunities to gain more than an elementary education and that only the children of the rich were patronizing the schools. It was shown, however, that of the 849 pupils in the high-school population, only 219 of that number were children of merchants and manufacturers, presumably of the wealthy class. The other 630 represented a class in the community who could not supply high-school education from their own resources.[2]

Others in the community objected to the high school because they considered it to be a place maintained merely for those desiring to enter college. This idea seemed to arise from "objectors" in other areas of the country which were being served by academies whose chief concern was a strenuous preparation for those entering college. In those areas, the emphasis was upon the classical course. In defense of the St. Louis high school, it was pointed out that the greatest attention was being given to those who desired a good secondary education, and that provision was made for those who did expect to attend college.[3]

By 1891 the high school was well established and was reported to be serving three functions. (1) It finished the education begun in the primary schools, and thus prepared the pupils for life participation. (2) It offered adequate preparation for

---

[1] Twenty-third Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, 1877, pp. 55-62.

[2] Twenty-ninth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 20-21.

[3] Thirtieth Annual Report of the Board of President and Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, 1844, pp. 54-55.

those who desired to enter college. (3) It provided professional training to young ladies intending to become teachers. In other words, it was a "finishing school, a fitting school, and a normal training school."[1]

Admission.--At the time of the opening of the high school, Superintendent Tice believed that high standards should prevail for those expecting to be enrolled. He suggested that all pupils should be expected to complete the study of the following books before leaving the grammar school to enter the high school: Stoddard's American Intellectual Arithmetic, Greenleaf's Common School Arithmetic, Mitchell's Geography, Greene's First Lessons in Grammar, Loomis' Elements of Algebra, Quackenboss' Composition (First Book), and to be able to analyze, classify, and give the general laws for delivery of all sentences, as far as continuous reading, in Mandeville's Course of Reading. In observing these standards, Tice stated that all the preparatory branches would then be mastered in the grammar schools where the per capita cost of instruction was at a cheaper rate.[2]

Admittance to the high school was open to all pupils of the city regardless of sex. It is interesting to note that while no distinction as to sex was made for high-school students, many of the lower schools were adapted either for male or female students. Admission examinations were required of all entrants, but tuition was free.[3] During the Civil War, as a temporary measure, it became necessary to levy a tax for the purpose of keeping the high school open.[4]

By 1885 the pupils in the district schools who were being recommended for admission to the high schools by the principals were so generally successful in their examinations that the principal of the high school suggested that the examination be modified so as to make it merely a test of the correctness of the district principal's estimate of the capacity of his pupils. There was to be no relaxation, however, of the standards to be main-

---

[1] Forty-first Annual Report, op. cit., p. 86.

[2] First Annual Report, op. cit., p. 35.

[3] Sixth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 86.

[4] Seventh and Eighth Annual Reports, op. cit., p. 19.

tained.[1]

In 1894 the board re-established the system of examination for admission to the high school. The provisions of the new rule were listed as follows:

> 1. No pupil is examined who does not bring a certificate of ability from his principal.
> 2. The examination questions are prepared by the Superintendent of Public Schools.
> 3. The examination is conducted by High School teachers in the various Grammar Schools.
> 4. The percentage of admission is 70, provided that the pupil falls in no study below the average of 50 per cent.
> 5. A re-examination in one study is granted to pupils making an average of 70 per cent but falling below the minimum of 50 in one study.
> 6. Pupils desiring to be admitted to the Normal course are required to make an average of 80 per cent.[2]

Six years after the board had established examinations as a basis for admission to the high school, the plan was discontinued. The pupils from the grammar schools were admitted on the recommendations of their principals. The plan was judged to be an improvement for several reasons. Educational opinion throughout the country seemed to be against putting too much stress on written examinations. Strain on the part of the children participating in the crucial test of a written examination for high-school entrance was thought to be too great and also unnecessary.[3]

Growth.--The increased numbers attending the high school focused attention very early on the problem of providing accommodations for high-school pupils. To relieve congestion, "branch schools" were created in 1871.[4] These will be discussed later in this report. By 1888 high-school work had to be provided in four different buildings in order to accommodate all the students. It was a cumbersome arrangement and was described as being almost equivalent to changing school three times in four years. The pupil entered the polytechnic building for one year. He was then transferred to the addition to the high school for a period ranging from a half year to a year. Finally, he was transferred to

---

[1] Thirty-first Annual Report of the Board of President and Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, 1865, pp. 17-18.

[2] Fortieth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 70.

[3] Forty-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 87.

[4] Seventeenth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 73.

the central school to complete the course. It was an unavoidable situation as long as there was no building large enough to accommodate the pupils.[1]

A new high-school building was completed in the fall of 1893. The total cost of the building when completed amounted to $354,797.76.[2] However, one high-school building was insufficient for a city as large as St. Louis. The superintendent of instruction, reporting for the year 1902-03, stated that the per cent of pupils in attendance in the high school of St. Louis did not compare favorably with other cities. In some cities one-tenth of the enrollment was in the high schools, while in St. Louis the high-school enrollment was about one-fortieth of the total enrollment.[3]

Two new high schools were completed and opened in 1904. The McKinley High School was opened in January, 1904; and the Yeatman High School in September, 1904. Each of the schools was equipped with recitation rooms, laboratories, and also provided for shops, machinery, and equipment for manual training. These schools were located so as to serve the various parts of the city.[4] With the completion of these new buildings, the board adopted the policy of maintaining lunch rooms for pupils. The principle introduced was that the lunches were not to be sold at a profit to the manager, but were to be provided for the benefit of the children. The board purchased the material and sold it at cost.[5]

High-school enrollment had increased on the average of 446 pupils each year for the ten years prior to that ending in June, 1911. In spite of the McKinley, Yeatman, and the new Soldan high schools, each high school was reported to be serving well up to or beyond what should be considered the maximum capacity of each school.[6] The Cleveland High School opened during the

---

[1] Thirty-fourth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 81-83.

[2] Fortieth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 15.

[3] Forty-ninth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 54.

[4] Fiftieth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 92-94.

[5] Ibid., pp. 103-04.

[6] Fifty-seventh Annual Report, op. cit., p. 63.

school year, 1915-16, with 370 more pupils than had been planned originally for its opening, scheduled the year previous.[1]

The period following 1920 was characterized by the rapid growth of the high-school enrollment. While in 1920, five high schools were in operation for white pupils, the number by 1944 had increased to eight not including the two branches. The enrollment in the high schools at the end of that year was 15,300.[2]

Organization.--It was pointed out earlier in this chapter that, from the beginning, the principle of coeducation was followed in the organization of the high school. All white students were housed for many years in the Central High School, and all colored students were accommodated by the Summer High School. As additional high schools were built, all were organized on the same plan. Each school was in charge of a principal who was responsible for the internal management of it. There was, in addition, an assistant principal, who assisted in such administrative aspects of the school as were properly delegated to him by the principal. The assistant principal acted in the absence of the principal. Sessions of the high schools were held each week day of the scholastic year except Saturdays.[3]

Judd characterized the high schools in 1918 as being of the cosmopolitan type as distinguished from specialized high schools. Each followed identical curricula and in all essentials the equipment of every school was of the same general character. He stated that the schools maintained a close relation to the central office and were under the general direction of an assistant superintendent. This arrangement served to give the schools great uniformity. The instruction was described as being of high type. It was found, however, that the courses and methods of study needed change and improvement in order to meet the varying needs of pupils within the widespread locality of St. Louis.[4]

Strayer, in reporting his survey in 1939 voiced some of the same criticisms concerning the high schools as were reported

---

[1] Sixty-second Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, 1916, p. 68.

[2] Ninetieth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 58.

[3] Fiftieth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 92-93.

[4] Judd, op. cit., II, 294-306.

in the survey of 1918. He found that the four programs of study for high-school students, classical, scientific, general, and modified general, gave entirely too much attention to college-entrance requirements. He recommended that more attention be focused upon the needs for general education of all youth.[1] There is some evidence that the board and present superintendent of instruction have recognized the shortcomings of the high school as reported. During the year ending in 1945, the board approved new courses in music, science, health, safety, language arts, and human values. These additions were made as a result of the board's decision to maintain schools to train for participation in an "ever moving, dynamic society."[2]

Extensions of the High School

Intermediate schools.--When the graded plan was put into effect in the St. Louis schools, certain pupils were observed who could not make progress at the normal rate. These pupils were described by Superintendent Harris as follows:

> In the first place, there is difference in capacity; the temperaments differ; the relative mental endowments differ; tastes differ. And yet, in the graded-school all are to be compared with the same standard. It is not surprising that evil consequences arise. The pupil is "sent over his course" again and again--falling back from class to class. He becomes stolid and lifeless, and reminds one never so much of the burnt-out coal in the grate which we name a "clinker." The teacher loses all patience: "The majority of the class cannot be kept back on your account alone!"[3]

To correct the remedy a special school was established in 1869, called the "intermediate school." Thus the pupils who did their best but failed to make normal progress could enter the intermediate school to take a slow course in the higher branches. This did not mean that the standards of admission to the high school were to be lowered.[4]

While the experiment of the intermediate school seemed at

---

[1] Strayer, op. cit., pp. 22-25.

[2] Ninety-first Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, 1945, pp. 20-21.

[3] Fifteenth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 105-06.

[4] Ibid., p. 107.

first successful, two years later Harris described these pupils as having a "contagious atmosphere" and tended to dampen the ardor of others, thus discouraged both teachers and pupils. Instead of schools for these pupils, he recommended periodic reclassification so that fresh and ambitious pupils could keep pushing up from below.[1]

Branch schools.--The branch high schools were developed to accommodate a greater number of high-school students, and were located in such a manner as to serve the students who lived at a great distance from the Central High School. By 1872 there were four such branches which accommodated the junior (freshman) class of the high school. Pupils were admitted under the same conditions at the branch high schools as they had formerly been to the junior (freshman) class of the Central High School.[2]

In 1881 the branch classes were reduced from six schools to three and were considered as parts of the Central High School. They were placed under the supervision of the principal of the high school and subject to the same principles of organization as the high school. The principals of the branch schools were personally responsible for the conduct of their separate schools, but were required to adopt the policy of the high school. They ranked as first assistants in the corps of high-school teachers.[3] Whenever high-school accommodations were sufficient, the branch schools disappeared.

The junior high school.--The superintendent of instruction proposed the organization of a junior high school to the board at its meeting on May 23, 1917. He proposed that the seventh, eighth, and ninth grades make up the junior high-school organization and that the instruction be on a departmental basis. Through such an organization, it was felt that the needs of adolescent children could be better recognized and cared for with the result that children would remain in school longer.[4] The Blewett Junior High School was organized and opened on September 4, 1917, with an en-

---

[1] Eighteenth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 50.

[2] Ibid., pp. 67-68.

[3] Twenty-sixth Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, 1880, p. 99.

[4] Sixty-third Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 124-34.

rollment of 1,026 pupils and a corps of 30 teachers.[1]

After three years of operation, the purposes of the junior high school were reported as being accomplished through three agencies:

> First, its general organization: Every teacher, every pupil and every parent is encouraged to be a partner in the carrying out of the program. Second, its administration: The enormous activity of everyone is coordinated and directed into a great community effort to achieve the greatest possible results, and every pupil and teacher receives recognition of his power to lead as well as his ability to follow the leadership of others. Third, its curriculum opportunities: The subject matter is closely scrutinized to make sure that it includes the most valuable material and that it excludes those processes and facts that have little or no social significance; the methods are carefully adapted to the needs of the pupils, helping them to read comprehendingly, to develop good study habits, to investigate, to weigh their facts and draw tentative conclusions, to master adequately all essential facts and processes, to measure by means of standardized tests and scales just how well they are succeeding, and to furnish individual help to those who need it. Furthermore, the curriculums are so planned that pupils may gain power in some subjects that make the greatest appeal to him because of his special interests and aptitudes.[2]

The Blewett School continued to operate as a junior high school through the year ending 1924. By action of the board, the junior high school became the Blewett Intermediate School.[3] By 1926 the Blewett and McKinley were operating as intermediate schools with a total enrollment of 3,218 distributed through the seventh, eighth, and ninth grades.[4]

By 1928 the number of intermediate schools had increased to four white and two colored. They were reported to be slowly evolving, but for various reasons had not been able to do what they were ultimately expected to do. The buildings they occupied were not designed for the purposes of the intermediate organization and no definite methods had been worked out to attain the objectives. There was marked activity in the effort to secure pupil participation in administration, pupil activities, and to

---

[1] Official Proceedings, op. cit., XXIV (September 11, 1917), 205-06.

[2] Sixty-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 63.

[3] Official Proceedings, op. cit., XXXI (September 9, 1924), 191-92.

[4] Seventy-second Annual Report, op. cit., p. 91.

provide methods suited to individual and group needs.[1]

During the retrenchment program, the seventh and eighth grades were moved from the intermediate schools to the elementary schools and the intermediate schools became high schools to accommodate the secondary enrollment.[2]

Ninth-grade centers.--To assist in accommodating the increased enrollment in the high schools, it became necessary to find accommodations elsewhere. To answer the need, ninth-grade centers were established and reported for the school year, 1933-34.[3] Since the elementary school enrollment had decreased, vacant rooms existed in many elementary schools. Each ninth-grade center became in reality a small one-grade high school, operating within the walls of an elementary-school building, under the local control and supervision of the principal. The teachers, however, were high-school teachers.

These centers were considered successful both financially and educationally. They reduced the costs and made transfer to the high school easier. During the year 1935-36 the number of such centers operating was twenty-one.[4] By 1943, however, decreased enrollments caused the board of education to close the ninth-grade centers.[5]

Kindergartens

Superintendent Harris, as early as 1871, alluded to the fact that young children in certain sections of the city would be much better off in school than to be outside and subjected to the corrupting influences present there. He suggested that the kindergarten system of culture might provide valuable hints on the methods of instruction for the lower grades.[6]

---

[1] Seventy-fourth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, 1928, p. 31.

[2] Eightieth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 15-16.

[3] Ibid., p. 62.

[4] Eighty-second Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, 1936, p. 24.

[5] Official Proceedings, op. cit., XLIX (June 8, 1943), 1376-80.

[6] Seventeenth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 38.

Again in 1872 he stressed the importance of beginning the training of children at an early age. He held that discipline was far more potent when applied to children of five than to those at the age of eight. He lamented the fact that the city of St. Louis had not been able to institute a kindergarten experiment in some densely populated locality of the city to determine its effect in preserving the children from the evil influence of the street.[1]

The following year, the board took the important step of establishing a kindergarten in the Des Peres school. Miss Susan Blow, described as a thoroughly competent and enthusiastic advocate of the kindergarten system, offered to undertake the management of an experimental kindergarten and the instruction of one teacher in methods, provided the board furnished the rooms and appointed one teacher. In discussing the results of the experiment, the formation of habits of cleanliness and politeness were considered as marked.[2] Another effect was described as follows:

> But the development of the intellect in making quantitative or mathematical combinations is more surprising. Geometry and arithmetic seem to unfold simultaneously in the minds of the pupils. They are trained to exercise their faculties in recognizing form, shape, and number, as well as in designing combinations with them. This training in the exact and quantitative is counterbalanced and compensated by a discipline of the phantasy and imagination. Manipulation, in various ways--drawing, folding paper into artistic forms, embroidering, construction with sticks and softened peas, modelling in clay--so as to train the hand and eye, is thoroughly practiced. It would seem as though Froebel had especially in view the education of a race of industrious and useful people.[3]

With the success of the kindergarten established, two additional schools were selected for development of the movement. A teacher, trained by Miss Blow, was placed in charge of each room. Two to five assistants were allowed each "director" or manager of a kindergarten. Assistants volunteered in such large numbers for the sake of the opportunity of learning how to conduct a kindergarten that it was unnecessary to pay for the services. Sessions of the kindergarten were for one-half day so that two different groups could be accommodated in the same room each

---

[1] Eighteenth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 18-19.

[2] Nineteenth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 19.

[3] Ibid., p. 19.

day.[1] Three years after the first kindergarten had been established, the number of kindergartens had increased to seven.[2]

By 1876 there were twelve kindergartens with twelve paid teachers called "directors" and thirty-eight unpaid teachers who served gratuitously for the purpose of learning the theory and art of Froebel. The age prescribed for entrance of kindergarten children was six years. After all applicants of the prescribed age had been enrolled, some five- and seven-year olds were admitted.[3]

By 1885 the kindergarten had been established as a fundamental part of the system of education, and the recommendation was made to place them as nearly as possible under the regulations governing the district schools. Kindergartens were considered as being definite units in the school since they were added to the regular rooms in determining the school's classification, the number of rooms being the determining factor. However, the principals had little educational authority over them. The basic differences between the kindergarten and primary grades were recognized and consideration given to the matter of leveling the barrier between these two divisions.

In spite of the early success of the kindergartens in St. Louis, they were not readily extended to all the schools. By 1888 only two colored schools out of thirteen had kindergartens, and it was pointed out that it would seem that the advantages of the training should be provided the most helpless and dependent class in the community. The expensiveness of the instruction was considered to be the real barrier to the desired extension.[4]

The cause of kindergarten education received a set-back in 1883, when the board of education was prohibited from receiving children under six years of age. Certain legislation and a court decision had established the fact that it was illegal to spend the board's funds for educating children under that age. Children were forced to enter the kindergarten when they had formerly left it, thus throwing the kindergarten into competition with the primary grades. To meet the difficulty, the board enacted a rule in

---

[1] Twenty-first Annual Report, op. cit., p. 95.

[2] Ibid., pp. 97-98.

[3] Twenty-second Annual Report, op. cit., p. 11.

[4] Thirty-fourth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 34-35.

1883 whereby schools having kindergartens could not admit children into the primary grades until they had reached the age of seven years, while in schools without kindergartens, the child could enter the primary grades at six.[1] This caused considerable embarrassment since only two-thirds of the schools had kindergartens.

To alleviate the problem, the board began experimentation in three schools with a plan of introducing elementary instruction in reading into the kindergarten. Since children between six and seven were not permitted primary instruction in certain schools, it seemed logical to begin instruction prior to entrance into the primary grades.[2]

A movement was begun to secure legislation to admit children five years of age, and possibly at four. The movement was strongly supported which was good evidence of the growing popularity of the kindergarten institution.[3] However, the legislation was not immediately forthcoming. The board accomplished the purpose, in part, by providing for the admittance of five-year-old children where such admittance did not require additional accommodations or teachers to those required for the six-year olds then in attendance.[4] In 1913 the long struggle to secure legislation authorizing the admission of five-year-old children to the kindergarten was brought to a conclusion by an act of the legislature. As a result, the board anticipated an increase in enrollment of between five and ten thousand children.[5]

At the time of celebration of the twentieth anniversary of the founding of the first kindergarten in St. Louis, there were eighty-four kindergartens in the city.[6] With the celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary, every large school in St. Louis had its kindergarten, the number at that time being 102. These were taught by 75 paid directors and 153 paid assistants. In

---

[1] Thirty-fifth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 38.

[2] Ibid., p. 39.

[3] Thirty-eighth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 13.

[4] Fifty-seventh Annual Report, op. cit., p. 166.

[5] Fifty-ninth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 13.

[6] Thirty-ninth Annual Report of the Board of President and Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, 1893, p. 19.

addition, there were 53 volunteer assistants employed. The total number of kindergarten teachers was listed as 281.[1]

The various annual reports of the superintendent of instruction contain in considerable detail the growth of the kindergarten movement. The work of the groups was scrutinized to identify results from the training. By 1875 kindergarten training under competent and well-trained teachers was expected to accomplish the following results: (1) establish a good physical development; (2) bring about quickness of invention and fertility of imagination; (3) develop a keen sense of symmetry and harmony; (4) form great mechanical skill in the use of the hands; (5) establish ability to form rapid judgments in number, measure, and size at a glance of the eye; and (6) develop initiative into the conventionalities of polite society in their demeanor towards their fellows, and in the matters of eating, drinking, and personal cleanliness.[2]

The kindergarten rooms at first were arranged to accommodate three large tables, each with about sixteen children, but this arrangement proved cumbersome in view of the variety of activities conducted in the room. Under the leadership of Miss Blow, the plan was adopted of providing small tables at which two pupils could be accommodated. The chairs and tables could be moved about the room as desired and adapted to the type of activity in progress.[3]

The teachings of Froebel were studied for all the implications in organizing the materials of the kindergarten. The general principle underlying the method seemed to be that of supplementing scientific methods in education by artistic processes. This idea found embodiment in the "gifts and occupations." In working with "gifts" a knowledge of solids, surfaces, and lines was developed. Work in the "occupations" included perforating, sewing, cardboard, and clay modelling.[4] In summarizing this development, Miss Blow stated,

---

[1] Forty-fourth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 125.

[2] Twenty-first Annual Report, op. cit., p. 97.

[3] Twenty-second Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 86-88.

[4] Twenty-fifth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 200-4.

> Hence the first use of the gifts is to waken, by their suggestiveness, the mind's sleeping thoughts, and the first use of the occupations to train the eye and the mind to be the ready servants of the will. While the child is still imitative in the occupations, he becomes inventive in the gifts; but as he grows to be more and more a law unto himself, he turns from the coercion of his blocks, tablets, and sticks, to obedient paper and clay, and, ultimately outgrowing the simpler occupations, concentrates his interest in the exercises of drawing, coloring, and modelling. These artistic processes, with a technical training according to the very successful Russian plan, might, it seems to me, be profitably introduced into our regular school-course.[1]

As the kindergarten came to be a fundamental part of the educational system, the need for articulating its contributions to the work of the grades became apparent. In the beginning, the kindergarten appeared to most individuals as a distinct organization having little or no direct relation to the work of the primary school. The primary teacher still began her work with no reference to what had already been done in form, color, number, and creative activity. The solution advocated was the formation of a course of study which would recognize the beginning processes of education in the kindergarten and the adjustment of the work in the primary grades to recognize these contributions. Only slight change was necessary to harmonize the work of these departments to recognize the fact that they were really only different degrees of progress in the same process.[2] However, coordination of the programs was not solved easily. Five years after the difficulty was first discussed, it still remained a problem.[3] The supervisor of the kindergarten and the supervisors of the primary schools interested themselves in developing a program of easy access from the kindergarten to the primary grades. By 1918 this matter had been pretty well solved.[4]

The influences of Miss Blow and Dr. Harris in the cause of the kindergarten movement have been given credit for establishing this division as a fundamental extension of the public schools in the United States. After the public kindergarten had been

---

[1] Ibid., p. 205.

[2] Twenty-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 154-55.

[3] Thirty-first Annual Report, op. cit., p. 181.

[4] Judd, op. cit., II, 47.

successfully established in St. Louis, other cities were not slow to take it up.[1]

In discussing the effects of the early leadership in establishing public kindergartens in St. Louis, Strayer, in his survey report stated that there have been some not entirely desirable results on the present program. He found that early practices in the kindergarten were so firmly established that the program has not been sufficiently modified to keep pace with the latest developments in the field. He recommended that the newer practices and research findings should be used to revise the program.[2]

Normal School

The need for supplying efficient teachers for the public schools of St. Louis was recognized as early as 1854 by Superintendent Tice. In that year, he advised that a normal department be added when the new high-school building was completed. He saw, in the establishment of such a department, a plan whereby high-school students and others desiring to qualify as teachers could be regularly taught in the theory and practice of teaching. He also suggested that a model school be established wherein the pupils of the normal class would be required to instruct, "under the eye of the Normal Professor," the branches required to be taught in the primary and grammar school.[3] In his Second Annual Report, Tice again urged the establishment of a normal school.[4]

The superintendent's recommendations were adopted by the board, and the St. Louis normal school went into operation on October 28, 1857. On October 26, an examination was held for admission of candidates and twenty-three young ladies took the examination, sixteen of whom qualified. In addition, twelve were admitted from the high school and two others were approved as teachers by the board. These constituted the first class of normal school pupils. Mr. Richard Edwards, formerly from the State Normal School in Salem, Massachusetts, served as principal and

---

[1] Edwin Grant Dexter, A History of Education in the United States, pp. 166-67. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1904.

[2] Strayer, op. cit., pp. 14-15.

[3] First Annual Report, op. cit., p. 18.

[4] Second Annual Report, op. cit., p. 75.

only teacher.[1]

The sessions of the first class were held in the high-school building. Before the end of that year, seventy students had been enrolled. During the year, Saturday classes were organized. These were for the public school teachers who were permitted to leave their classes a half day each week for the instruction, and when this became impossible, the group voluntarily formed themselves into a Saturday class.

In 1858-59 the normal school was moved to the third story of the Franklin building. In 1861 a tuition fee was levied because of the increased financial burdens incident to the war. In January, 1852, the normal and high schools were placed under one head and the normal school transferred to the high-school building. The superintendent, however, in 1862-63 again moved the normal school to its old quarters where it remained until it was moved to the Polytechnic building in 1869.[2]

By 1880 there were forces in the community which favored abolishing the normal school. A few years prior to that time there were fewer teachers being required. This condition had come about for a number of reasons. (1) There had been almost no increase in the number of new schools. (2) The system of using "extra" teachers in the larger, overcrowded rooms had been discontinued. (3) Colored teachers were being appointed to teach in the colored schools, thereby releasing the white teachers for other schools. (4) The regular teachers were required to handle German classes which released additional teachers for new assignments. (5) There had been fewer resignations as a result of the business depression. (6) Many teachers who had been out of teaching for a number of years asked for re-employment. (7) The quota of fifty-six pupils per teacher was rigidly adhered to, so that in spite of an increase in pupils, fewer teachers were needed.[3]

In order to soften the criticism concerning the expense of the normal school, a plan of supplying normal students as substitutes proved worth while. The year before this system went into operation, the money spent for substituting was nearly

---

[1] Fourth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 41.

[2] Fifteenth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 34-36.

[3] Twenty-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 71-72.

$14,000. This represented about $4,000 more than the cost of operating the normal school, thus there was an actual saving of that amount through the plan. The success of the plan depended upon the quality of the teaching by the normal students, and the principals reported efficient results.[1]

For several years, the accommodations for the normal school had been considered inadequate. When it appeared that the Franklin School was to be remodelled, the normal school was moved to that building. One further advantage of the move was that the classes of the district school would be available to normal students for practice teaching.[2]

After thirty years of operation, it was reported that of all the teachers in the public schools, two-thirds had been graduated from the normal school. The influence of these teachers extended to more than thirty thousand children in the public schools.[3] By 1898, however, the number of graduates awaiting assignment to teaching positions had become so large, that the normal course was closed to all applicants.[4]

Within a few years after closing the normal course, the board was threatened with a serious lack of teachers. Eligible graduates of the high school were assigned as apprentices. In view of the need, the board of education began the erection of a new building for the teachers' college. Until the building had been made ready for use, the work of the college was done in the Yeatman High School.[5]

The new building, opened in 1905, was constructed at a cost of $177,000.00 and designed specifically for its use as a teacher's college. One of the principal features of the new building was the "observation" room which was planned to enable students and teachers to observe the teaching of classes of children. The new building was located near the Wyman district school which helped to establish a permanent relationship between the district

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 67-69.

[2] Twenty-ninth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 54-55.

[3] Thirty-third Annual Report of the Board of President and Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, 1887, p. 72.

[4] Forty-fourth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 65.

[5] Fiftieth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 66-67.

school and the college.[1] The board, at its meeting in July, 1910, voted to change the name of the teachers college to the William Torrey Harris Teachers College as a tribute to the memory of their distinguished superintendent.[2]

Ten years after the operation of the new Harris Teachers College, Dr. John W. Withers, the principal, reported that it had assumed under the board of education, three distinct functions. These were described as being: (1) the training of new teachers for the city's public schools; (2) the further general and professional training of those in the employ of the schools; and (3) the scientific study of problems of city school teaching, supervision, and administration.[3]

The granting of the Bachelor of Arts Degree was approved by the board in 1919. This resulted in renewed interest in the school's extension department since many teachers became interested in securing credits leading to a degree.[4] In March, 1924, the North Central Association placed Harris Teachers College on its list of approved teachers colleges and in the same year, the University of Missouri voted to admit to its graduate school any persons who had received the A.B. Degree from Harris Teachers College since 1921.[5]

Admission.--The normal school was established to train persons of both sexes to become teachers in the St. Louis public schools. All persons who had been graduated from the high school and any other qualified persons in St. Louis who had attained the age of sixteen years could be admitted upon his willingness to sign a statement to the effect that he intended to teach in the public schools of St. Louis, and that he would remain in the normal school for a year, or until honorably discharged.

The applicant was expected to be of good moral character, physically competent, and possess the ability to pass a satisfactory examination in reading, writing, spelling, defining, arith-

---

[1] Fifty-second Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 78-79.

[2] Fifty-seventh Annual Report, op. cit., p. 76.

[3] Sixtieth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 126.

[4] Sixty-seventh Annual Report, op. cit., p. 24.

[5] "History of Harris Teachers College," Public School Messenger, XXX (September 1, 1932), 14-15.

metic, geography, English grammar, history of the United States, algebra, and music.[1] By 1871 the conditions of admission had been changed to require the age of seventeen and upwards for admission. By rules of the board, pupils from the high school could be admitted according to stated conditions without examination providing their scholarship and deportment had been satisfactory in the high school.[2]

The requirements for admission to the normal school were raised so that no applicant could be admitted who was not a graduate of the St. Louis public high school or who could not pass the high-school examinations.[3] This resulted in a great decrease in the number who applied. The conditions were therefore changed in 1885 so that applicants who had finished two years of the high-school course could be admitted.[4] The normal course then became embodied in the high-school course. After completing the high-school course, the student served as an apprentice in the schools and then received his normal school diploma.[5]

After reopening the normal school as a teachers college, requirements for admission were again raised to admit women graduates of the high school only, and preference was given to those students who had pursued the classical and scientific courses.[6] Applicants were also required to furnish a certificate in regard to general health, hearing, and eyesight.[7] Graduates of non-public high schools and high schools in other areas of the state could obtain admission only by examinations.[8] This requirement was later abolished, so that graduates of high schools could be admitted without examination.

Course of study.--The prime object of the normal school was to train pupils for teaching in the grammar and primary de-

---

[1] Seventh and Eighth Annual Reports, op. cit., p. xliii.

[2] Seventeenth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. xxxii-xxxiii.

[3] Twenty-fifth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 67.

[4] Thirty-first Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 58-59.

[5] Forty-fourth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 61-62.

[6] Fiftieth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 67.

[7] Fifty-first Annual Report, op. cit., p. 255.

[8] Fifty-eighth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 71.

partments. The course of study was developed to include a thorough review of the branches usually taught in those schools with special reference to the instruction involved. The board furnished all books and stationery needed in the normal school.[1] The course as organized covered the work of two years, and definite courses were outlined for each of the quarters within each year.[2]

In describing the course for the normal school, Miss Anna C. Brackett, principal, described the course in 1867 as follows:

> In a school of this kind, where the course consists of one junior and one senior year, the studies and methods of the first should bear the same relation to those of the second that the warp does to the woof in the products of the loom. Theoretically, Normal Schools should concern themselves only with methods of teaching; practically, all over the country, they have to do much preparatory work. As far as possible, this should be done in the junior year. Threads should be taken up and arranged side by side, loose ends fastened, weak places strengthened, defects of whatever kind repaired. The work should be more of details, of facts. But in the senior year, these should give place to broad generalizations--to a view of relations--till every thread of the woof holds in its place, firmly secured as an essential part of a whole, the threads of the warp, before useless, because disconnected.[3]

The course of study was modified slightly after 1870. The culture studies were placed mainly in the first year of the course, and the second year was devoted to a review of the common branches of the district schools, with reference to the methods of teaching. Thus algebra and geometry were studied the first year, and arithmetic the second. General history, natural philosophy, zoölogy, physiology, and physical geography were also taught the first year in order that a more intelligent study could be made of political geography, English literature, and the constitution of the United States during the second year.[4]

While high-school graduates were allowed to complete the course of study in the normal school in one-half year, during its early history, the course was lengthened to one year to permit the students to enter more deeply into the study of the science

---

[1] Fourth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 42.

[2] Sixth Annual Report, op. cit., p. xvi.

[3] Thirteenth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 20.

[4] Nineteenth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 31-32.

of teaching.[1]

By 1885 there were two courses provided in the normal school. For students who had not graduated from the high school, a general course was prescribed. The course embodied two-and-one-half years of training in the following subjects: arithmetic, geography, grammar, reading and elocution, composition, course of reading, English literature, Latin or German, hygiene, natural science, vocal music, drawing and penmanship, mental philosophy, theory and art of teaching, and history of education. The special course was for graduates of the high school and embraced the following studies: arithmetic, geography, grammar, reading, composition, hygiene, natural science, vocal music, drawing, penmanship, mental philosophy, theory and art of teaching, and history of education.[2]

When the normal course became a department of the high school, a part of the third year and the whole of the senior year was devoted to normal training. The first two years were given exclusively to certain preparatory studies, such as drawing.[3] Under that plan, a student needed to complete a fifth year of training in order to secure the normal school diploma. The extra year was devoted to apprentice work in the schools under the supervision of principals and experienced teachers.[4]

On October 12, 1909, the board of education authorized the extension department of the teachers college to provide courses of study equivalent in training and cultural value to the first three years of the customary university courses leading to the Bachelor's Degree. Teachers could then finish the degree at any university of their choice.[5]

While the new teachers college established in 1904 required only one year of class work and one year of apprenticing, an additional half year was added to the course in 1909 and the apprenticing reduced to a half year. By 1919 the board had begun the policy of granting the A.B. Degree, and by 1924 had established

---

[1] Twenty-second Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 40-41.

[2] Thirty-first Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 93-94.

[3] Forty-first Annual Report, op. cit., p. 87.

[4] Forty-fourth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 61-62.

[5] Sixty-second Annual Report, op. cit., p. 113.

a four-year curriculum. The two-year curriculum, however, was not dropped until 1926.[1]

Demonstration school.--Very early in the history of the normal school, the board of education established a school for observation. The Washington School was selected. The pupils of the senior class in the normal school visited the school once a week to become acquainted with the character of the schools in which they were expected to teach and to observe practice in proper methods and practices. Thus, the prospective teacher first observed, then taught for a time under the supervision of qualified teachers and principals before having independent charge of rooms.[2]

In 1910 the Wyman School was made the demonstration school for Harris Teachers College. A plan was adopted whereby the student was made responsible for a specified number of hours of practice teaching. The periods were organized so that the practice teaching covered every subject taught in the elementary school. The student teaching was placed under the direction of the Harris faculty working in co-operation with the Wyman faculty.[3]

Evening Schools

The first evening schools in St. Louis were supported by private contributions. Superintendent Tice expressed himself as favoring these institutions from the first. He advised and recommended that the board make them a part of the system and establish them in all parts of the city.[4] In a move to support the evening schools, the board began to share the expenses with the O'Fallon Polytechnic Institute. Under that arrangement, a joint committee from the two contributing agencies conducted the schools. The accommodations provided were sufficient to provide for five of six hundred scholars and the enrollment during the first five years of operation ranged from six hundred to twelve hundred, with an average attendance of from three to five hundred.[5]

---

[1] "History of Harris Teachers College," op. cit., pp. 14-15.

[2] Nineteenth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 51-52.

[3] "History of Harris Teachers College," op. cit., p. 15.

[4] Second Annual Report, op. cit., p. 75.

[5] Fifth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 38-39.

The evening schools opened on Monday, October 3, 1859, to continue for sixteen weeks under the exclusive management and supervision of the board without any assistance from any other corporation. The following regulations were in effect: (1) sessions were held on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday evenings from seven to nine-thirty; (2) schools for males were conducted at the Jefferson, Benton, Madison, and Mound buildings, and a school for females was conducted in the high-school building; (3) no member under twelve years of age, no member of any day school, and none who did not give satisfactory assurance of regular attendance could be enrolled; (4) students under eighteen were required to bring certificates from a parent, an employer, or other responsible person which gave personal data for reference; (5) the branches taught in the schools were not to extend beyond spelling, reading, writing, geography, arithmetic, English grammar, history of the United States, and bookkeeping. The whole number of scholars enrolled for the term was 861.[1]

Superintendent Divoll recognized the need for evening schools, especially for the meritorious persons who had limited means of self-improvement. He did see, however, a danger in extending the evening schools at the expense of the day schools. He pointed out certain shortcomings of the evening schools. (1) Parents tended to have children withdraw from day schools for securing remunerative employment with the hope of supplying education through night instruction. (2) A majority of the pupils enrolled remained too short a time to gain much lasting value. (3) The instruction appeared to be less energetic, less exact, and given with less discipline than that in the day schools. (4) Evening school classes rendered the classrooms unfit for day schools. (5) The per capita cost for instruction was greater in proportion to the benefits than it was in the day schools. As a partial remedy for the situation, Divoll recommended that no applicants less than fourteen be admitted and that substantial evidence be required as to worthiness of character and a guarantee of faithful attendance throughout the term.[2]

The instruction offered in the evening schools covered mainly the same material presented in the day schools. The

---

[1] Sixth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 37-38.

[2] Thirteenth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 46-48.

O'Fallon Polytechnic Institute as a branch of the school system began in 1868 and served as a school to complete the system which had for several years been operating in the evening schools.[1] In addition to the ordinary branches, a higher course was offered which included the following:

> Line Drawing, Higher Arithmetic, Algebra, Geometry, Chemistry, Natural Philosophy, English Grammar, and such other branches of technological instruction as may be required by a sufficient number of pupils to form a class.[2]

Eight years later, another evening school was established for teaching the higher branches.[3]

The board entered upon the school year, 1879-80, with the idea of "strict economy" and strict compliance with the rules governing the appropriation and expenditure of money. As a result, there were twelve fewer evening schools in operation than in the previous year when the number had been forty-one. Enrollment was decreased by 1,747.[4] The following year the evening schools were limited to the O'Fallon Polytechnic Evening School and ten district schools.[5] However, the number began to increase in succeeding years. For the year ending 1884, there were in operation sixteen schools for whites, and nine for colored.[6]

During the school year 1918-19, the division of extension was organized. A full-time supervisor was placed in charge. The adult education program was broadened to give education to illiterates, provide civic education for the foreign-born, and other forms of educational extension as authorized by the board of education.[7]

During the school year 1937-38, the evening schools offered eighty courses, which included vocational as well as high-school credit courses. The policy of adding courses as needs developed was still being maintained. Standard high-school diplomas were

---

[1] Fifteenth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 75.

[2] Seventeenth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 91.

[3] Twenty-fifth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 146-47.

[4] Twenty-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 9.

[5] Twenty-seventh Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 112-13.

[6] Thirtieth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 142.

[7] Sixty-fifth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 56.

issued upon the completion of sixteen units of accredited high-school work. No tuition was charged for any resident of St. Louis, although a small charge was made for supplies.[1]

For the school year 1945-46, the St. Louis evening schools adult education program offered classes in grade-school subjects, general high-school subjects, trades and industry, selling and distribution, home and family life, and special subjects desired by twenty or more people. In addition, provisions were made for classes in lip reading, gymnasium, Americanization, and Red Cross.[2]

Special Schools

School for deaf.--On December 10, 1878, the committee on course of study recommended to the board that a vacant room in the Franklin Branch be given to Mr. D. A. Simpson, for the purpose of instructing a class of deaf mutes.[3] The board adopted a report of the joint committee of teachers and legislative committee, which recommended that a teacher be employed for the remainder of the scholastic year, at a salary not exceeding $50 per month for that period, the committee believing that this trial would be sufficient to determine what the action of the board should be in undertaking this branch of instruction permanently.[4]

In 1879 the school for deaf-mutes was moved to the Jefferson building. After two years of operation, the number of pupils belonging had risen to thirty-two. Two teachers were employed to instruct. The manner of instruction embodied the principle that language is more important than the sign. The meanings of words were taught through pictures, and pupils were sometimes asked to translate their own sentences into signs which made up their own natural language. The success of the school was attributed to the fact that suitable instruction was provided without removing the children from parental care or home influences.[5]

---

[1]"St. Louis Public Evening Schools," Public School Messenger, XXXV (January 2, 1938), 91.

[2]"St. Louis Public Evening Schools Adult Education Program, 1945-1946" (pamphlet).

[3]Official Proceedings, op. cit., III (December 10, 1878), 162.

[4]Ibid. (April 8, 1879), p. 212.

[5]Twenty-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 120-22.

One of the early objectives in teaching deaf-mutes was to accustom the pupils to associate with hearing and speaking pupils so that they become like them socially. After two years of operation, it was reported that these handicapped pupils were able to communicate with relatives and friends and that they appeared to be contented and happy in these associations.[1]

Effort was made to keep the school cognizant of the newer phases in the teaching of deaf-mutes. Early in the history of the schools the question of teaching the "manual" or the "oral" system arose. Simpson, who was in charge of the school, studied the leading views. While he saw some advantage in the oral system, he felt that the manual system had more merit since he felt there was greater mental development in that plan.[2] By 1890 a special teacher of articulation was added to give training in speech.[3]

By 1884 the school for deaf-mutes had established itself firmly in the public school system. In that year it was reported that there were probably less than ten to twelve deaf-mutes within the city who were not receiving education. The only parents who failed to send their deaf-mute children to school appeared to be those who objected to public schools on religious grounds or who did not realize the serious consequences of allowing their children to grow up in ignorance.[4]

An important epoch in the public school for the deaf occurred during the year, 1901-02, with the assignment of a special building far away from the crowded part of the city for the use of this school. The building was entirely refitted by the board for the special school.[5] During the school year, 1926-27, the new Gallaudet School for the deaf was opened. The cost, exclusive of equipment was $313,480.38.[6]

Special schools for individual instruction.--Superintendent

---

[1] Twenty-seventh Annual Report, op. cit., p. 124.

[2] Twenty-ninth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 100-105.

[3] Thirty-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 52-53.

[4] Thirtieth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 150.

[5] Forty-eighth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, 1902, p. 139.

[6] Seventy-third Annual Report, op. cit., p. 9.

Soldan recognized that there were many pupils within the district schools who could not progress with the normal pupil. Three schools for instructing the mentally defective were therefore opened as a response to the need. Buildings were chosen with special reference for the use to be made of them. They were comfortable, detached residences with ample room and ground. Each building could accommodate two groups of fifteen each. The average daily attendance in the three special schools operated during the year 1907-08, was 84.[1]

The supervision of these special schools was placed in the hands of a successful supervisor of the elementary schools. Teachers for these schools were also carefully selected. In discussing the work of these schools, the supervisor stated that the special schools had been planned for the child, who because of mental or physical defect, found it impossible to receive benefit from class instruction, but who was nevertheless educable.

Permission was secured from the parents to enroll any given pupil in the school. Complete histories were made for the various children and careful records made of abilities and accomplishments. Fundamental skills were taught from organized games and excursions into the community. Special attention was given also to music, gymnastic exercises, and recitation of simple memory gems. Handwork and manual training were found to be very helpful subjects. A medical adviser assisted in selecting the pupils for these schools and rendered such assistance as needed.[2]

These first schools were regarded as being so successful that three additional schools were planned for the following year. Two of the schools were for white and one was for colored.[3] By 1911 there were nine special schools for mentally handicapped. The supervisor in reporting for that year stated that of the 563 pupils enrolled in these schools since their organization, 14.9 per cent of the children had gone into gainful occupation, 6.5 had been returned to the grades, thus making a total of 21.4 per cent of those enrolled, who had been helped materially because of their training in the special schools.[4]

---

[1] Fifty-fourth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 237.

[2] Ibid., pp. 238-39. [3] Ibid., p. 240.

[4] Fifty-seventh Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 94-100.

Vacation schools.--These schools were founded in 1905, by the Civic League, and the first vacation school was opened in the Jefferson School building. The average attendance during that year was 389. The following year, a second school was located at the Laclede School. In the summer of 1907, the two schools became incorporated into the regular public school system. All details of their operation, therefore, were taken over by the board of education.

The practice of opening the vacation schools one week after the close of the district schools provided time to secure assistance from the principals, teachers, and volunteers. The "downtown" pupils in the crowded areas were the children whom these schools were designed to accommodate. Bulletins were issued to provide information to prospective pupils. Instruction was offered in raffia, reed, drawing, games for boys, games for girls, cooking, housekeeping, manual training, and kindergarten. A class in hammered copper was offered in 1909 for older boys.

Teachers connected with these schools reported that success had been achieved through the construction work particularly in the teaching of: (1) skill in the use of various tools and a knowledge of how to take care of them; (2) honesty in work; (3) habits of accuracy and close observation; (4) familiarity with various kinds of materials; (5) adaptation of design to a particular kind of work; (6) a strength and skill for attacking any of the trades; (7) a discovery of an interesting world outside of textbooks, mastery of which can be gained only by patience and efforts.[1]

Industrial school.--By 1905 the board of education recognized that it was responsible not only for the care of the public schools, but also that it was expected to look after the educational interests of all the children of the city. It began to focus attention on those children who were handicapped by their misfortunes or by the "evil tendencies which they may have inherited." The board agreed to assume the task of educating the children in the House of Refuge beginning with September, 1905.[2] A contract was negotiated between the board and the city for the

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 169-73.

[2] Fifty-first Annual Report, op. cit., p. 27.

education of the children in the House of Refuge, which then became known as the industrial school. A principal and teachers were appointed and arrangements made by the board to furnish textbooks and supplies. The contract provided that children under fourteen should be in school throughout the day, and that those over fourteen should attend one-half day and spend the other half in labor for the institution. After school hours, the care of the children remained with the authorities of the industrial school, who occupied the same position with reference to the children as did the parents of children in other schools.[1]

The industrial school, as organized, consisted of three distinct departments: one for dependent white children with seven grades and two kindergarten teachers; one for white delinquent children with five teachers; and one for colored delinquent children with two teachers. In addition, a domestic science and a manual training teacher were provided for the school.[2]

The experiment of dual authority between the board of education and the board of managers appointed by the mayor of the city for the institution was regarded as a success. By 1907 it was reported that the instruction was a demonstrated success and no longer an experiment.[3] The enrollment by 1911 had grown to 511 and the only drawback to its operation, in the opinion of the board, was the costliness of the operation.[4]

The industrial school was closed on February 19, 1920, when the last group of delinquent boys was transferred to Bellefontaine Farms.[5] Bellefontaine Farms had been used as a home for delinquent boys for several years. In 1915 the board agreed to accept the responsibility for the education of the boys housed there.[6] Teachers were selected and assigned to instruct the fifty white delinquent boys in residence there. The boys were grouped

---

[1] Fifty-second Annual Report, op. cit., p. 16.

[2] Fifty-sixth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, 1910, pp. 167-68.

[3] Fifty-third Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 8-9.

[4] Fifty-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 20.

[5] Sixty-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 48.

[6] Official Proceedings, op. cit., XXII (September 14, 1915), 209-13.

according to age, disposition, temperament, and degree of delinquency, and each group was kept separate for instructional purposes. Each cottage had a married couple in charge to serve as house father and house mother. The married couples were expected to create, as far as possible, a normal home life for the delinquent boys.

Instruction was arranged so that certain groups received training in school subjects, while the other groups were at work on the farm, in the garden, in the barn or dairy, or in the buildings under construction. After the day's work about the farm or in the school room, recreation periods were provided. Effort was made in all activities to foster the type of attitude and training which would restore the delinquent boys to normal life.[1]

Open air schools.--The board of education, in 1912, became interested in making special provision for the care and education of tuberculous children. The attorney rendered an opinion to the board in which he held that the board could legally provide suitable clothing, and chairs and couches, but that food, nurse, and appliances of hospital character could not be provided. The St. Louis Open Air School for 1911-12, had enrolled 35 pupils who had been maintained by the Society for Prevention of Tuberculosis and instructional costs for them had been borne by the board of education.

The board began proceedings to bear all costs for maintaining and instructing the children, as permitted by law, with the understanding that the St. Louis Society for the Prevention of Tuberculosis bear other costs. Plans were made for providing new accommodations for pupils of the Open Air School.[2]

The new open air school, located on South Grand Avenue was opened on April 12, 1914, with an enrollment of 121 pupils and a corps of six teachers and one principal. In addition, there was one nurse and one bath attendant. In this phase of school work, St. Louis was described as being pre-eminent in the country in caring for pretubercular children.[3]

In November, 1918, the board approved a plan for co-

---

[1] Sixty-second Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 211-16.

[2] Fifty-ninth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 137-41.

[3] Sixty-first Annual Report, op. cit., p. 17.

operating with the tuberculosis society in the establishment of a resident open air school to which fifteen girls from the Taussig Open Air School were transferred. The children transferred were those in greatest need of special care. The results obtained by having the children in an open air environment both day and night were so satisfactory that at the end of the year, the experiment was continued.[1]

The type of pupil acceptable to the open air schools was described as follows:

> Children that are acceptable, according to the rules of the Board, are those who are physically below par, who come from a tuberculous environment, or who have been actively tuberculous but are now in an arrested stage. They must also be in the first to the eighth grade of school work. We do not take deformed children, serious heart cases, incorrigibles, mental defectives, or truants.
>
> Any case that becomes actively tubercular is immediately sent away from school and becomes, in our opinion, a hospital case. A school is maintained at the Koch Hospital for cases of this kind.[2]

Continuation schools.--Part-time education for certain pupils was made compulsory beginning July 1, 1919. The board set about to organize classes for about five thousand pupils who fell within the provisions of the legislative enactments. The city was divided into districts and centers of instruction were organized for the working boys and girls between the ages of fourteen and sixteen years. Efforts were made to co-operate with the employers in arranging instructional periods.

Pupils were asked to choose some trade or vocational subject, such as woodworking, machine shop practice, auto-mechanics, electricity, mechanical drawing, dress-making, millinery, and cooking. After a trial, some misfits were transferred from their classes to others more suitable for the individuals. A conference plan emerged for the purpose of giving information concerning occupations and providing assistance to pupils in making their choices. As a result of the first year's operation, much valuable information was gathered for use in succeeding years in offering vocational guidance and providing courses to answer pupil needs.[3]

---

[1] Sixty-fifth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 15.

[2] Sixty-seventh Annual Report, op. cit., p. 120.

[3] Sixty-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 103-31.

The avowed purpose of the course of study was to: (1) make the junior employee more efficient to his employer; (2) fit him for an occupation; and, (3) prepare the pupil for more effective citizenship.[1]

The supervisor of continuation schools, writing in 1923, discussed the ends of these schools as follows:

> The ends to be sought and in a measure attained are: a. The large investment in education already made by the State in these children may be conserved. b. The Civic and industrial intelligence of the children may be promoted and extended. c. Vocational guidance and the opportunity for prevocational or vocational work may make the young workers more efficient on the present job, may help them to discover vocational aptitudes, and may begin to prepare for the future jobs. d. The difficulties of transition from school to employment may be lessened by sympathetic and understanding counsel. e. The profitable use of leisure and of recreation may be developed. f. Habits of health, thrift, industry, and a proper care for the safety and right of others may be inculcated.[2]

School for physically handicapped.--Plans for the Elias Michael School for physically handicapped white children were adopted by the board of education and the contract let on June 24, 1924. The building was opened for school purposes on September 8, 1925. The building, as completed, contained provisions for classrooms, kindergarten, assembly room, domestic science, lunch room and kitchen, a rest room, a shop, principal's office and corrective therapeutics as follows: isolation room, dental clinic, dressing room, tub room, general clinic, nurses and physicians room, mechano-therapeutics room, plaster room, corrective exercise room, and room for wheel chairs.[3] Enrollment in this school at the end of its first year of operation was 137.[4]

Vocational school.--The board of education in December, 1926, adopted a resolution that there be a school established, of vocational type, to serve the needs of those who anticipated early employment. The school was to be known as "The Vocational School,"

---

[1] Sixty-seventh Annual Report, op. cit., p. 83.

[2] Sixty-ninth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, 1923, p. 47.

[3] Seventy-first Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, 1925, p. 303.

[4] Seventy-second Annual Report, op. cit., p. 95.

although there was no building to adequately house such a school. Vacant rooms were to be used until a more suitable building could be found.[1] The school was moved to the Central High School in 1927. Because of the damage of a tornado, the school was again housed in various buildings throughout the city.[2]

On October 16, 1928, preliminary plans for the new Hadley vocational school were submitted by the building commissioner and approved by the board. The academic unit was designed to accommodate fifty classrooms and four laboratory suites. The building was also equipped with an auditorium and gymnasiums for both boys and girls. Laboratory and shop units were planned to provide instruction in a wide variety of vocations.[3]

The enrollment during the year, 1929-30, was 1,839 students. The superintendent in that year reported that while St. Louis had been slow in the development of occupational training, the purpose for the new school was to surpass the vocational education provisions in other large cities. Industries were contacted in order to ascertain the type of courses to offer, and effort was made to secure desirable contacts in maintaining the co-operative plan in the training of students.[4]

The Hadley vocational school was well adapted for the War Workers Training Program sponsored by the Federal Government. During 1942-43, 8,721 men and women were trained. The main departments of the program were the Naval training school, machine shop department, welding department, signal corps school, and the aircraft department. The Naval electrical school at Hadley received special commendations both from Army and Navy leaders.[5]

Negro Education

Prior to the Civil War, the education of Negroes was definitely prohibited. Any masters who were found guilty of teaching

---

[1] Official Proceedings, op. cit., XXXIII (December 14, 1926), 569-70.

[2] Ibid., XXXIV (May 8, 1928), 1384-85.

[3] Ibid., XXXV (October 16, 1928), 451-54.

[4] Seventy-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 18-19.

[5] Eighty-ninth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 59-62.

Negroes to read and write subjected themselves to heavy penalties.[1] In spite of these penalties, some education of Negroes was carried on. Many slave owners and a large share of the citizens of St. Louis were opposed to the laws prohibiting education of Negroes and encouraged and aided schools wherever they found them open for instruction.

As early as 1817, Rev. J. M. Peck, a white Baptist missionary came to St. Louis and began a school for white children. In 1818 he opened the school for instruction of Negro children and adults. The school opened with fourteen pupils and increased in enrollment to ninety within a month. Other missionaries also provided instruction for Negroes.

By 1850 Negroes (most of whom were free) were paying taxes on property assessed at nearly three million dollars and, therefore, paid a considerable amount towards the school tax. All of their taxes had gone for the education of white children since none of it could be used, because of legal obstacles, for the education of Negroes. The board of education, during this period, was reported to have been in favor of contributing to the support of schools for the Negroes and were anxious to assist in a financial way. On February 20, 1865, the Missouri legislature removed the legal obstacles to the support of Negro education.[2]

Elementary schools.--During the year ending 1865, five schools for colored children were sustained, with an aggregate of fifteen hundred pupils. They were governed by a "Board of Education for Colored Schools," composed of colored men, aided and counseled by several of the city's most eminent and patriotic citizens. The funds for supporting these schools were raised partly among the colored people and partly by donations from individuals and from the Sanitary Commission. As evidence of their interest in these schools, the board of directors of the St. Louis public schools appropriated five hundred dollars for their maintenance.[3] In 1866 the board gave positive instructions to a special committee to rent suitable buildings and open schools with as

---

[1] Laws of Missouri, 1825, Vol. I, pp. 132-33.

[2] "Facilities for Negro Education in St. Louis," Public School Messenger, XXXV (January 3, 1938), 92-93.

[3] Eleventh Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, 1865, p. 26.

little delay as possible.[1]

The following year, three schools for colored children were established and were attended by four hundred and thirty-seven pupils. Number 1 was held in a building owned by the board, and was conducted by three teachers. Schools Number 2 and 3 were conducted in rented buildings, and each had two teachers. The total cost of operation for these schools for the year 1866-67 was listed at $6,213.56.[2]

There were five classes of colored schools in operation by 1867: (1) those established by the board of public schools; (2) those supported in part by the Freedmen's Bureau and partly by tuition fees; (3) those supported partly by benevolent societies and partly by tuition fees; and (4) those sustained wholly by tuition fees. There were in operation, during that year, from twelve to fifteen schools attended by some three thousand children.[3] By 1871 the accommodations for the colored schools were reported to be equal to those provided for the white schools.[4]

The cause of colored schools was advanced during the year 1878 by the provision of colored teachers for the colored schools. The plan, considered at first as more or less as an experiment, was judged very favorable. It was reported that the attendance had increased 40 per cent on the number enrolled in the colored schools the year previous.[5]

At the close of the year ending in 1900, there were 3,196 colored children in attendance in twelve different colored schools.[6]

Shortly after 1900, the organization for colored schools was described as follows:

> Separate schools for the education of colored children are maintained by the Board in conformity with the laws of the state, and in harmony with the evident requirements of local conditions. The teachers and principals of these schools are all of African descent. The general supervision of the colored schools, and special instruction in music,

---

[1] Twelfth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 40.

[2] Thirteenth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 32. [3] Ibid.

[4] Seventeenth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 90.

[5] Twenty-fourth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 128.

[6] Forty-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 257.

> drawing, and physical culture, are in the hands of the same corps of supervisors as provided for white children, and this implies the same standards of accomplishment in each of the grades. The schools for colored children include all grades from the kindergarten to the high school, and the same requirements are made in regard of efficiency of work.[1]

By 1920 colored enrollment in the elementary schools at the close of the year had increased to 8,326, and instruction was being given in seventeen different school units.[2] The number attending during the fourth quarter of the school year ending in 1940, was 16,627,[3] and at the close of the school year 1943-44, the number enrolled for all colored elementary schools had increased to 17,618.[4]

High schools.--Although instruction for colored high-school students was provided for as early as 1875, very few students took advantage of it. High-school instruction was provided in the Sumner district school. The first high-school classes were unable to complete more than the first year of the high-school course. Actually, the high school for Negroes may properly be said to have begun with the year 1885.[5]

On June 9, 1885 the board of directors awarded certificates of graduation to Emma L. Vashon and John T. Pope, two colored graduates of Sumner High School.[6] The following year, two additional students of Sumner High School had completed the course of study for the high school and were awarded diplomas for graduation.[7] The principal, reporting for the year ending in 1892, stated that during the preceding eight years, the Sumner High School had graduated seventy-two girls and twenty-one boys.[8] This school was greatly improved during the year 1902, by the addition of six classrooms for the purpose of supplying manual training

---

[1] Fiftieth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 119-20.

[2] Sixty-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 252.

[3] Eighty-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 30.

[4] Ninetieth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 66.

[5] Thirty-eighth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 58-59.

[6] Official Proceedings, op. cit., V (June 9, 1885), 379.

[7] Ibid. (June 8, 1886), p. 577.

[8] Thirty-eighth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 61.

facilities for boys, and domestic science training for girls.[1]

For several years there had been a felt need for a new high school to accommodate colored students. On January 14, 1908, Mr. Wm. B. Ittner, the commissioner of school buildings, submitted preliminary plans for the new Sumner High School to be erected on Cottage and Pendleton avenues. These plans were adopted by the board. The building was designed to accommodate five hundred pupils and contained: classrooms, drawing rooms, science rooms, rooms for domestic art, shop rooms, commercial rooms, library, auditorium, gymnasium, lunch rooms, locker rooms, teachers' rooms, and administration rooms. Modern systems of heating and ventilation were specified.[2] The contract for the building in the amount of $297,827.00 was approved in September, 1908.[3]

The new Sumner High School opened during the year, 1910-11. The great changes in environment, together with new classrooms made it possible for the school to enter upon a new mode of life with varied interests and activities. The new situation was described by Assistant Superintendent Bryan as follows:

> The adequate material equipment has resulted in improved scholarship, awakened ambitions, increased self-respect, intense loyalty to the school, a just and commendable pride in its good name, a general determination to make the spiritual and intellectual correspond with the physical attributes of the school. The care taken of the new building and of the equipment shows plainly the appreciation by the pupils of their advantages. During the entire year, only one pencil mark has appeared on the walls, and that by actual measurement was less than an inch long.[4]

Enrollment increased from 447 the year previous to its opening to 549, which represented approximately a gain of 23 per cent.[5] In June, 1914, the salary of the principal of Sumner High School was placed on the same schedule as that for principals of the other high schools.[6]

---

[1] Forty-eighth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 110.

[2] Official Proceedings, op. cit., XV (January 14, 1908), 310-12.

[3] Ibid. (September 8, 1908), pp. 866-67.

[4] Fifty-seventh Annual Report, op. cit., p. 88.

[5] Ibid., p. 89.

[6] Sixtieth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 151-52.

In 1927 a second colored high school was opened. While it had been the intention to open this school as an intermediate school, it was decided later to open and equip it as a senior high school to serve the district east of Grand Boulevard. The opening of the second colored high school further stimulated the interest of colored parents. The total enrollment for the fourth quarter of the year, 1927-28, was 3,554, which represented an increase of 982, or 38 per cent more than that for the previous year.[1] Enrollment in colored high schools for the year ending in 1940 was 3,153,[2] and for the end of the year 1944, the number was 3,007.[3]

Special Schools for Negroes

Evening schools.--The first evening schools for colored were reported for the year 1867-68. Sessions were held in School Number 1, Number 2, and Number 3. During the year, the total colored enrollment for the three schools was 378. The subjects offered were reading, spelling, arithmetic, writing, geography, and grammar.[4] Evening schools for colored have continued throughout the history of the schools in much the same manner as those for whites.

Schools for mentally defective.--The first special school to be placed in operation for Negro children was Special School Number 6. This school was reported in 1908-09, as having sixteen colored pupils in its registration.[5] By 1922 special Negro pupils were reported as follows: Bellefontaine farms school: registration of 90; city hospital: registration of 56; boys' training classes: registration of 20; special school: registration of 60.[6]

Open air schools.--On July 10, 1923, the building commissioner was directed by the board of education to prepare preliminary plans for an open air school for colored children to be

---

[1] Seventy-fourth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 30-31.

[2] Eighty-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 30.

[3] Ninetieth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 62.

[4] Fourteenth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 67-68.

[5] Fifty-fifth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 301.

[6] Sixty-eighth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 124-26.

located on the board's property at Kennedy Avenue, opposite Tandy Park.[1] The contract for this building was let on July 8, 1924, in the amount of $226,865.00. The building was opened for school purposes on September 8, 1925, as the "Charles Henry Turner School for Physically Handicapped Colored Children."[2]

The building was described as follows by the building commissioner:

> The plan presents a two-story building and contains on the first floor for crippled children two class rooms with toilet accommodations between the rooms, a corrective exercise room, isolation room, plaster shop, dental clinic, doctors' and nurses office, general clinic and dressing room. For the semi-sighted two class rooms, and for general use a combined gymnasium and playroom, boys' shower room, boys' toilet room, girls' shower room and girls' toilet room; also, ample space for heating and ventilating apparatus.
>
> On the second floor there are three class rooms for open air pupils, two class rooms for the deaf, and in general a rest room, stock room, sewing room, emergency toilet room for boys and girls, and a home economics room, a lunch room, a kitchen and two shops; also, a principal's office, book room, and waiting room, and ample storage space on both floors.[3]

Vocational school.--The board of education, as a result of the superintendent's report in June, 1929, began considering arrangements for a vocational school for colored students. The director of housing and a board committee was directed to study the possibility of vacating the Carr Lane elementary school for white children in order to provide for the vocational school. After investigation, the joint committee on instruction and the vocational school recommended that the Carr Lane school be used for vocational work for colored, and was to be started in September, 1929. The report received favorable action by the board.[4]

The building was equipped to offer instruction in a number of trades and vocations, and for the first year of its operation enrolled a total of 391 pupils.[5]

Normal school.--The principal of Sumner High School, in reporting for the year ending in 1892, stated that in the early

---

[1] Official Proceedings, op. cit., XXX (July 10, 1923), 127.

[2] Seventy-first Annual Report, op. cit., p. 309. [3] Ibid.

[4] Official Proceedings, op. cit., XXXV (June 11, 1929), 1734-35.

[5] Seventy-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 20.

history of the high school it had been necessary to give examinations to secure teachers and employ young persons with no more than two years of high school for teaching at the high-school level. However, since 1889, graduates of the high school had entered the normal class for one year before becoming teachers.[1] For the year 1891, there were fourteen normal graduates from Sumner High School and for 1892, thirteen graduates.[2] Some of the graduates of Sumner High School completed two years training in kindergarten work and thus qualified themselves as directors and assistants in the kindergartens for colored children.[3]

By 1901 the importance of the normal school held in connection with Sumner High School was well established. The one defect in the training given was attributed to the fact that there was no immediate connection with the work of the elementary school. As opposed to the plan for white normal school graduates, the colored graduates were sent out immediately to substitute in the schools.[4]

The year 1920-21 was described as a "red letter" year in the history of colored children in St. Louis. During that period, the provision of extension work for the vacation period and for afternoons of the regular school term was established. Thus the Sumner training school became the Sumner normal course as a separate and distinct unit from the high-school curriculum. Out of one hundred and ninety-nine elementary teachers and twenty-seven kindergarten teachers, seventy enrolled for the various courses. Seventeen of that number were prevented from attending because of summer assignments.[5] By action of the board in 1929, the Sumner Teachers College became the "Harriet Beecher Stowe Teachers College."[6]

In 1924 the two-year course was changed to a four-year course. In the fall of 1927 the Simmons School was made a training school for student teachers of Stowe Teachers College. The

---

[1] Thirty-eighth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 58.

[2] Ibid., p. 66. [3] Fortieth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 74.

[4] Forty-seventh Annual Report, op. cit., p. 83.

[5] Sixty-seventh Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 48-49.

[6] Official Proceedings, op. cit., XXXV (February 12, 1929), 983.

elementary school was organized in 1930 so that training was given from the kindergarten through the eighth grade. Teachers of the training school provided demonstration lessons for student teachers, who were required to do practice teaching during the fourth year of their training. In 1932 the Stowe Teachers College became a member of the American Association of Teachers Colleges.[1]

---

[1] "History of Stowe Teachers College," Public School Messenger, XXX (September 1, 1932), 17.

CHAPTER VI

SUPERVISION OF INSTRUCTION

A study of administration would be incomplete without a consideration of school supervision as one of its important aspects. This matter occupied the attention of some of the first leaders in the St. Louis public schools. As early as April, 1853, John H. Tice, editor of Teacher and Western Educational Magazine and superintendent of schools in St. Louis the following year, wrote a discussion of school supervision in which he held that any successful business enterprise required an employer or special agent to watch over it. He believed that a successful school system needed the same careful attention.[1]

Supervision by the Board of Directors

The board of directors assumed the responsibility for supervising the earliest schools in St. Louis. The type of supervision performed by the board was that which might be called "sitting in judgment." Section 63 of the "Rules for the Government of the Board of President and Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools" stated that the president should appoint visiting committees of two members each for the different school districts whose duty it would be to visit such schools as were assigned to them as often as practicable for the purpose of examining these schools.[2] The committee was instructed to report their findings in writing at the expiration of the quarter. The visiting committee stated in the Sixth Annual Report of the board of directors that it had attended the annual examination and had found that the examination had passed off in a manner which was creditable to the school and also satisfactory to the committee.[3] In addition

---

[1]John H. Tice, "School Supervision," Teacher and Western Educational Magazine, I (April, 1853), 136-41.

[2]Fifth Annual Report, op. cit., p. xxx.

[3]Sixth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 30.

to the board's visiting committee, an invited committee of citizens designated by the board attended some of the examinations held. The examinations were to show the public the progress and advancement which the scholars had made.[1]

There is some evidence that the officers of the board accepted their supervisory duties somewhat seriously. It is a matter of record that it was the policy of the board to award a higher degree of appreciation and preference in promotions and appointments to those teachers who were most successful in controlling their pupils without the use of corporal punishment.[2]

The effectiveness of this early type of supervision was questioned by Superintendent Tice.[3] He did not believe that the public examination served to demonstrate the worth of the teaching that had been accomplished. He stated that the conduct of examinations was often merely a "re-hash" of exercises that may have been drilled upon for days. In order to remedy this evil, he suggested that a director of each ward visit his respective school at the beginning of the year with a list of the membership of the school and hear class recitations, noting the lessons cited and the pages covered. He also urged each director to make a record of the recitation for each member of the class in order that he might compare it with the performance six months later and again at the end of the school year. By following this procedure he felt that genuine progress could be determined.

As the numbers in the schools increased, the position of the superintendent of schools seemed to be strengthened. With this development, specific supervision of the board of directors gave way to a more professional type of supervision. It was this type which Tice had advocated in 1853, prior to his official appointment as superintendent.[4]

Supervision by the Superintendent

According to the records, the superintendent was the first person officially designated to supervise all the schools. The

---

[1] Ibid., p. 64.

[2] Seventh and Eighth Annual Reports, op. cit., p. xviii.

[3] Tice, op. cit., pp. 137-39.

[4] First Annual Report, op. cit., p. 22.

report of the president of the board, submitted in 1854 to the board of directors of the St. Louis public schools, suggested that it be made the duty of the superintendent to examine all the classes under the charge of principals or assistants to ascertain the progress which had been made and also to determine whether the mode of instruction used conformed to the general plan.[1] He was further instructed to determine whether there had been any mental discipline or training. In the event the superintendent found himself unable to perform these duties he was empowered to require the principals to act in his stead.

There is some evidence that the early superintendents attempted to carry out the instructions of the board in the matter of supervision. The report for the year ending in 1856 contained comments by the superintendent upon the progress made in teaching the various subjects in the curriculum. An investigation of the writing situation revealed that it was inferior to that of the year before.[2] He observed that the writing was "entirely too ornate for beginners" and that it was also different in gradual and scientific development, as well as unmethodical in arrangement.

Results from the teaching of reading were found to be unsatisfactory. The following quotation gives a clear idea of the difference between a good and poor reader as held by the superintendent and his criticism of one of the devices used to teach reading:

> The clap-trap reading exercises gotten up to make an exhibition pass off smoothly are too shallow devices any longer to deceive even the simple-minded and unsuspecting. The stern fact that the boys and girls who gained such applause for their reading on exhibition days, fail to read anything else intelligibly, demands to be accounted for. The day for such devices is gone by; and until our sons and daughters can take up and at sight read any author, and can convey clearly with all their fine shadings his ideas, and excite the same sentiments and feelings, as those under whose inspiration the author wrote, so long will the fact of a failure to teach reading successfully, stand as a swift witness against educators.[3]

In addition to his keen interest in improving the teaching of subject matter, Superintendent Divoll was interested in improving the organization and classification of schools in his charge. He visited the schools of Philadelphia and New York for

---

[1] Ibid. [2] Third Annual Report, op. cit., p. 34.

[3] Ibid., p. 28.

the purpose of studying their systems. The types of discipline and instruction in operation in these cities were also matters which he hoped to study for the purpose of bringing improvements to the schools of St. Louis.[1]

During the regular school year Divoll spent much of his time in actual supervision of the schools. The report for the year 1857 stated that he visited schools six hours daily, leaving the special duties of office for after hours.[2] By following such a schedule he was able, in that year, to make seven hundred visits to different schools and twice that many to individual classrooms.

Superintendent Harris also was active in evaluating the schools and in noting progress made in the various subjects. In reporting for the year ending in 1870, he likened the poor teacher to an unskilled army captain unable to menage a company of soldiers in a single mass. The good teacher, according to Harris, uses each individual in the class to give insights to other members in the group. In the same report he discussed the various subjects in the curriculum in detail.[3] He found that the results in arithmetic were inferior to those obtained in cities in the east and in the north. He reported that new experiments were being developed to determine the correctness of the theory held by many of the teachers to the effect that climatic conditions were responsible for the deficiencies found in St. Louis.

In spite of the tremendous growth of the schools by 1900, Superintendent Soldan, like his predecessors, maintained an active interest in classroom management and techniques of teaching. The following quotation concerning reading is typical of the type of discussions which he gave for other fields:

> When a child reads aloud in school, all the other children are expected to follow with attention. It is perfectly proper practice to let them pay critical attention to mistakes which the pupil reading may make. It is not proper to let the critical spirit with which a class listens predominate to such an extent that it lessens the appreciation and joy that may be derived from the new acquaintance with a masterpiece of literary art.[4]

As the duties of the superintendent became more numerous

---

[1] Fourth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 9. [2] Ibid., p. 10.

[3] Sixteenth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 172-73.

[4] Forty-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 183-84.

and complex it was necessary for the assistant superintendents to assume many of the responsibilities for supervision which had before fallen to the superintendent.

Supervision Delegated to Subordinates

Assistant superintendent.--Probably the next phase in the development of supervision in St. Louis was characterized by increased attention on the part of the administrative officers subordinate to the superintendent; namely, the assistant superintendents and the principals. The first assistant to play an active part in supervision was Harris. Soon after his appointment he became concerned with the reading situation.[1] He began a general examination of all the schools to determine the "mode" and "proficiency" of reading. Whenever good results were obtained in one school, other schools were invited to try the methods which had brought about this success.

The matter of penmanship also received the attention of Harris.[2] He submitted questions to pupils concerning the Spencerian system of writing and found good results. He also collected specimens of handwriting which he filed in the office for comparisons with the results of handwriting obtained from other cities.

As the system grew it became necessary to perfect a better organization for systematic supervision of the schools. The city was divided into districts, each district being assigned to one of the assistants for daily visits. In addition to visiting schools, examining classes, and testing, assistant superintendents took part in the conduct of classes held on Saturday at the normal college for the instruction of apprentice teachers.[3]

When the staff was enlarged to include a number of specialists for supervision of subject-matter fields, the work of the assistant superintendents became more general in nature. Coordinating the work of principals, supervisors, and teachers became a matter of concern. By 1916, however, the relationship between special supervisors and principals was reported by at least one assistant to be rapidly becoming what it ought to be. Super-

---

[1] Thirteenth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 56.

[2] Fourteenth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 57.

[3] Forty-third Annual Report, op. cit., p. 21.

visors were urged to confer with the principal before entering upon the work within a school, and to report to him upon progress made and upon problems needing his special attention.[1]

Principal.--Section 23 of the "Rules for the Government of the St. Louis Public Schools" charged the principal with the general supervision of the grounds, buildings, and appurtenances of the school.[2] He was also to be held for the neatness and cleanliness of the building. While these duties pertained largely to matters of building and grounds, there is some evidence that he was likewise interested in the instructional side. The report of the high-school principal for 1860 described the work of a Captain Hammersley who had been responsible for "orthosomic and hygienic exercises in the school."[3] The Captain had been present an hour and a half three days of each week during the year. The girls had participated in his exercises for forty minutes twice each week. The drills were varied and designed to exercise all parts of the body. The principal reported almost universal satisfaction with the work. The pupils liked it, teachers thought they noticed beneficial results, and the parents seemed satisfied.

By 1870 steps had been taken to relieve the principals of teaching duties in order to increase their responsibilities as local supervisors. The report of the president for that year stressed the importance of this development and noted that excellent results had attended this increase of supervisory power.[4]

During the superintendency of Harris, principals of first-class schools were given supervisory powers over other schools designated by the board of education.[5] In the supervision of such schools, weekly visits were required and the observations made were to be reported on prescribed forms. The report covered: (1) general condition of the school; (2) the efficiency of teachers in discipline and instruction; (3) the classes visited and their condition; (4) the classes approved for promotion from book to book, or from grade to grade; (5) any irregularities found in the

---

[1] Sixty-second Annual Report, op. cit., p. 276.

[2] Seventh and Eighth Annual Report, op. cit., p. xxxv.

[3] Sixth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 17-18.

[4] Sixteenth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 9.

[5] Twenty-first Annual Report, op. cit., pp. lxvii-lxviii.

observance of the rules of the board; and (6) the date and amount of time consumed in each visit.

The superintendent called supervising principals to meetings for consultation on measures for improvement of the schools or on other matters pertaining to local schools. However, principals were not relieved entirely from teaching, as each was required to teach not less than two classes and not more than four classes daily. The plan, as developed, made possible a twofold supervision.[1] The principal observed the work of his school in its minute details, while the superintendent considered it from its general results and in comparison with the standard of all schools.

By 1888 two assistant superintendents were given the supervision of the city schools, whereas only one assistant in English instruction had been available before.[2] With this change in administration, each principal devoted his entire time to his own school.

The importance and prestige of the school principal increased as more of his time was spent in close supervision of his particular school.[3] He directed his school and arranged every detail according to his own judgment. Supervisors and even the superintendent offered suggestions and criticisms through the principal. His office represented the highest local authority.

In the management of his school, the principal was expected to maintain a close personal contact with the children themselves.[4] In his round of daily visits he was urged to participate, when feasible, in the work of instruction then going on, thus manifesting his interest and making his presence felt. Through such procedures the principal came to know not only teachers but pupils personally, a condition enabling him to be more direct in his personal influence.

The principal used his daily visit and contacts with pupils, teachers, and parents as a means of improving instruction and general school conditions.[5] The teachers' meeting also played

---

[1] Seventeenth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 190.

[2] Thirty-fourth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 21-22.

[3] Forty-fourth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 79.

[4] Ibid., pp. 83-84.

[5] Ibid., p. 84.

an important part in harmonizing and unifying the work. The success of the meetings depended upon the tact of the teachers and the personal qualities of the principal.

As the principal gained prestige, so also did he gain responsibilities. He became not only the teachers' guide but the rules of the board made him also the judge of their qualifications.[1] It was necessary to report upon the efficiency of the individuals in his charge, and promotions were made upon his recommendation.

In his survey of the public schools, Judd found the principal to be an important administrative officer.[2] The powers of the principal in relation to his school were described as essentially those which the superintendent exercised over the whole department. His power and influence were limited only by his ability or his willingness to assume them. Principals were sometimes assigned to special duties, such as the supervision of grade manual schools during the summer vacation or of evening schools during the school year.

The survey made in 1939 commended the policy of the administration of the public schools in placing large responsibility in the hands of the principals of the schools.[3] The practice of allowing individual schools wide variations in development and procedures was praised. The principal in the St. Louis public schools today enjoys an important position in the educational system.

Supervision by Subject-Matter Specialists

Very early in the history of the public schools certain subjects received special attention. According to reports as early as 1844, a sum of money was paid to a Mr. Chappelle for teaching music in the schools.[4] The report to the board for the year ending July 1, 1859,[5] carries the announcement that a second music teacher was to be added for instruction in the intermediate

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 86-87. [2] Judd, op. cit., I, 64-65.

[3] Strayer, op. cit., pp. 258-59.

[4] "Music in the St. Louis Public Schools," Public School Messenger, XXXV (January 3, 1938), 94.

[5] Fifth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 43.

and primary grades and for assistance in giving examinations in this subject.

German instruction in the schools was considered important enough by the year 1866 to merit the appointment of an additional superintendent for the supervision of the German department.[1] By 1867 the board employed two music teachers, one drawing teacher,[2] and were being urged by Harris, the assistant superintendent,[3] to employ a special teacher for penmanship. The special teacher of penmanship would not relieve the regular teacher of responsibility for teaching the subject but would bring aid and stimulation to the ordinary instruction in it.

There is little doubt that the first special teachers employed were little concerned with supervision. However, by 1875 the four music teachers employed were instructed to "visit schools, give special lessons, and supervise the work of their special department."[4] By 1893 the schedule of salaries by rank listed the specialists as supervisors, these being supervisors of music, drawing, and physical culture.[5]

The annual report for the year ending on August 1, 1883, contains a special discussion by the supervisor of drawing.[6] Uniformity in teaching fundamentals of the subject was urged. The importance of drawing in intellectual culture and mental training was indicated as being fundamental in general education.[7] The breadth of vision which seems typical for some of the first supervisors for special subjects is indicated in a discussion of the aims of drawing taken from the supervisor's report to the superintendent in 1890.

> The chief aim is that of correlation, that is to say, to make drawing useful to other studies, and vice versa. There can be no doubt that the tendency throughout the country to correlate the studies of the Public School course, is quite as strong as formerly, and to use drawing as a medium of expression is even more desired and attempted. Some ideas are

---

[1] Thirteenth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 15.

[2] Ibid., p. 61.

[3] Ibid., p. 75.

[4] Twenty-first Annual Report, op. cit., p. 181.

[5] Thirty-ninth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 53.

[6] Twenty-ninth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 139-40.

[7] Ibid., pp. 136-37.

> expressed in words; other ideas, especially ideas of form, can be more adequately expressed by drawing.[1]

While the reports studied contained no actual report of a music supervisor until 1895,[2] there seems to have been some supervision of that subject prior to that time.[3] The report for the year ending August 1, 1895, stated that the three supervisors examined the music classes and marked them according to the standard attained during the year. The results of such examinations served to stimulate both pupils and teachers to do good work.

While there were attempts to strengthen the regular teacher's work in the teaching of certain subjects by the help of specialists in particular fields, there was no desire to reduce her control over the children which she taught. The policy of keeping the teacher in direct control of all the English studies pursued was maintained.[4] In spite of this policy there were some who did not welcome the supervision provided.[5] There were those who felt that any direction from outside sources resulted in a stifling of the individuality of the teacher. In contradicting these claims, Superintendent Long stated that the individuality of any teacher consisted of her experience coupled with that of the results of the experiences of others, hence special supervision should enhance the teacher's individuality rather than hinder it.

Superintendent Blewett expanded the policy of securing additional supervision for certain subjects in the curriculum.[6] He held that it was impossible for the regular grade teacher to keep thoroughly informed concerning changing subject matter and new methods of presentation. He believed that real improvement in teaching resulted from the assistance of those on the staff who were specialists and expert in branches which teachers had not had the opportunity to study.

The supervisory force for special fields grew very rapidly

---

[1] Forty-fourth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 128.

[2] Forty-first Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 144-46.

[3] Thirty-first Annual Report, op. cit., p. 198.

[4] Thirty-third Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 18-19.

[5] Thirty-fifth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 100.

[6] Fifty-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 217.

in the period from 1909 to 1920. Positions created during that time were: a supervisor of hygiene who was to be a skilled physician,[1] a supervisor of manual training,[2] a supervisor of school gardens,[3] two supervisors for the high-school divisions of commercial subjects and English,[4] and a supervisor of school orchestra.[5]

A study of school costs made during the school year 1913-14 for eighteen cities revealed that St. Louis ranked twelfth in its per capita expenditures for elementary pupils, yet the per capita cost for subject-matter supervision ranked sixth among the eighteen cities.[6] This would indicate a rather favorable position of the St. Louis schools in the matter of supervision for this period.

Supervision by Division Specialists

Not all of the growth which occurred in the supervisory staff about 1900 was due to the expansion of specialists for subject-matter fields. Shortly after 1890 a different type of supervision appeared which also added to the supervisory force. Since more than half the children enrolled in the schools were to be found in the primary division, the board of education appointed "three competent ladies" as primary supervisors. They were instructed to visit classes in the lower grades, to call teachers' meetings, and to improve the methods of instruction in every way possible. Apprentice teachers also were to be under the direction of these new supervisors when assigned to them.[7]

The board of education, in addition to supplementing the supervisory force, found liberal means for improving the department of instruction in other ways. A contingent fund was created for the purpose of enabling the superintendent, his assistants,

---

[1] Fifty-fifth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 182.

[2] Fifty-ninth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 213.

[3] Sixtieth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 249.

[4] Sixty-fifth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 14.

[5] Ibid., p. 15.

[6] Sixty-ninth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 41.

[7] Forty-fourth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 152-53.

and the supervisors in leading positions to visit other cities for the purpose of acquainting themselves, through direct observation, with whatever progress they could find in the field of education.[1]

As a means of imparting new ideas to the teaching force, demonstration teaching soon became popular.[2] On certain days as many as twenty-five teachers in the same grade in different schools would meet to observe a lesson taught by a specified teacher. The better features of the work presented would be noted and practiced by those present at the meeting.

Another expansion in the staff, similar to the appointment of supervisors for the primary field, was the addition of a supervisor for evening schools. The growth and importance of the evening schools warranted the attention of one individual who could devote himself to their improvement. His entire time was to be given to these schools during the time in which they were in session and to other duties which might be assigned to him in relation to the evening schools.[3]

Supervisory Organization from 1920 to 1940

Table 1 shows the size of the supervisory staff in 1919-20, 1929-30, and 1939-40. While the size of the staff remained about the same for each year, there are some rather significant changes from period to period. Supervisors for continuation schools, educational extension, and schools for individual instruction were omitted from the staff by 1930. A supervisor of special schools was added to the staff. While the number of those of the staff whose supervision concerned the various units of the school organization was reduced, the staff concerned with supervision of subject-matter areas was augmented. Supervisors of commercial subjects, foreign languages, household arts, physical sciences, safety and social sciences were added.

By 1940 supervisors for commercial subjects, foreign languages, safety, and social sciences were discontinued. The number of penmanship supervisors was reduced from three to one. The

---

[1] Ibid., p. 150.

[2] Fifty-first Annual Report, op. cit., p. 240.

[3] Fifty-fourth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 235.

supervisor of equipment and libraries became a supervisor of libraries. While there was no supervisor of kindergartens by 1940, positions were created for supervisors of high schools and ninth-grade centers. Two supervisors were designated in the field of health education. It is significant that vocational home economics and vocational teacher training were given attention by a special supervisor for each field.

TABLE 1

THE SUPERVISORY STAFF FOR ST. LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN EACH OF THREE PERIODS, 1919-20, 1929-30, AND 1939-40

Area of Supervision	Number on Supervisory Staff		
	1919-20[a]	1929-30[b]	1929-40[c]
Commercial subjects	..	1	..
Continuation schools	1	..	..
Drawing	9	7	7
Educational extension	1	..	..
Equipment and libraries	..	1	..
Foreign languages	..	1	..
Health education	..	..	2
High school	..	..	1
Household arts	..	1	1
Kindergarten	1	1	..
Libraries	..	..	1
Manual training	..	..	1
Music	11	9	13
Ninth-grade centers	..	..	1
Penmanship	2	3	1
Physical and biological sciences	..	1	1
Physical training	10	7	7
Primary	3	2	3
Safety	..	1	..
Schools for individual instruction	1	..	..
School gardens	2	1	1
Social sciences	..	1	..
Special schools	..	1	1
Vocational home economics	..	..	1
Vocational teacher training	..	..	1
Total	41	38	43

[a] Sixty-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 23.

[b] Seventy-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 44.

[c] Eighty-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 24.

The survey staff in its study for 1939 made the observation that some of the supervisory offices were holdovers from old

positions, and that they should be gradually eliminated in favor of a newer type of supervisory service in which much of the work now done by the staff could be centralized and redistributed.[1]

Recent Developments

In October, 1942, the board of education took an important step in the matter of supervision. In order to improve the effectiveness of supervision in various subjects and special fields of the curriculum, the superintendent of instruction was authorized to designate the teachers assigned to Harris Teachers College to serve as supervisors for a specified portion of their time. This arrangement made it possible to utilize the college facilities for holding conferences, conducting work shops for teachers outside of school hours, and providing expert help to teachers in all fields by specialists or consultants in their respective fields. This arrangement also created a situation in which the teachers who directed the college training of prospective teachers would also serve as supervisors or consultants after the student joined the regular teaching staff.[2]

As a result of the changed policy for supervision, the position of consultant was created and the superintendent was authorized to assign consultants to the teachers colleges on any schedule of salaries authorized for teachers in the college.[3] Due to the changed policy, the number of supervisors decreased from thirty-one for the year ending 1941-42 to eleven for the following year.[4] By the end of the year 1944, seven consultants were reported as members of the Harris Teachers College. The eleven supervisors reported were listed as follows: one each for distributive occupations, household arts, libraries, physical and biological sciences, physical training (recreation), and special schools. Five supervisors were reported for music.[5] The present

---

[1] Strayer, op. cit., p. 355.

[2] Official Proceedings, op. cit., XLIX (October 13, 1942), 385-94.

[3] Ibid. (December 8, 1942), p. 555.

[4] Ibid., L (July 13, 1943), 124.

[5] Ibid., LI (July 11, 1944), 106-7.

supervisory organization is so constituted that attention can be given to the various areas needing assistance, and is closely united to those who have the responsibility of providing the system with its educational philosophy and administrative policy.

CHAPTER VII

SCHOOL-BUILDING PROGRAM

Providing housing accommodations for the school population of any city is an important problem in city school administration and one which cannot be solved apart from the educational program. In discussing this problem Dr. Judd once said, "The fact is that a school building is in a very important sense of the word a concrete embodiment of the whole school policy."[1] A study of the school-building program in St. Louis reveals the significance of this statement.

On January 30, 1817, the legislature of the territory of Missouri enacted a law entitled "An Act to Incorporate the Board of Trustees for Superintending Schools in the Town of St. Louis." Certain individuals were specified by this act to serve as trustees. Among the duties of the board of trustees were:

> . . . . take into consideration the state of the grants and donations, for the use of schools, and devise means for securing the same, and of putting them into a state of profit, and as soon as the state of the funds which may be appropriated will justify, shall erect or procure suitable buildings, and provide the necessary apparatus for instruction, and shall transact such other business as they shall find necessary and proper to be done, towards establishing schools in the Town of St. Louis.[2]

The board created by this act began its activities soon after its formation by leasing certain vacant lands for nominal rents. In 1826 other leases were made. However, these leases were made with very indefinite description of boundaries. Not much else is known of the transactions of this board. With the growth of the locality the people wished to exercise closer control through their own chosen agents. They had no desire to continue in power the board of trustees created by the act of 1817 as

---

[1] Judd, op. cit., I, 12.

[2] First Annual Report, op. cit., p. 43.

a closed corporation.[1]

A charter for a new school board was granted by the legislature on February 13, 1833, which constituted the whole white population of the city as a corporate body to be styled the "Board of President and Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools," and vested the powers of the corporation in the president and directors who were required to be free white males over twenty-one years of age.

Early School Buildings

District (elementary) schools.--As early as 1834 movements were made toward establishing schools when the first revenues were received for rents.[2] In 1836 sites were selected for two schoolhouses. On July 18, 1837, a committee of the board reported that the lots were too small to carry out the original plans and recommended the construction of two-story instead of one-story buildings, as called for by the original plan. It was agreed to erect the two-story buildings, one to be known as the north schoolhouse, or School Number 1, and the other as the south schoolhouse, or School Number 2. The north school was soon found to be in an undesirable location, owing to a growing market place, and was early abandoned.[3]

The early school buildings were built so that the monitorial type of instruction could be used. The Jefferson School, located at the corner of Ninth and Washington Streets, occupied a space of land forty-two feet wide and sixty-four feet deep. The building as organized had a primary department, a male grammar department, and a female grammar department.

The first story housed the primary department and could accommodate two hundred and ten pupils. The seats used in the primary department were "forms"; in other words, they were merely long benches with small boxes for slates and books between pupils. The "forms" to the right of the teacher were occupied by male pupils and those to the left by female pupils. At the back of the large room were two smaller classrooms, one for boys and the other for girls.

---

[1] Thirteenth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 103. [2] Ibid.

[3] First Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 51-52.

The second story housed the male grammar department and could accommodate one hundred and forty-four pupils. The desks were constructed so that the seats of the pupils in front formed a part of the desks of those in the rear. Each desk accommodated two pupils. Two smaller rooms at the back of the large room served as classrooms. The third story housed the female grammar department and was similar to the second story except as to the entrance.

The Webster School, located on Jefferson Street west of Eleventh, was a three-story building similar in arrangement to the Jefferson School. The seats, however, were single seats with high backs and shelves under the seats for books and slates. This school, like the Jefferson, was heated with stoves. The Webster, however, was designed for furnaces, the idea being abandoned because of unsatisfactory experiments with furnaces in other schools. Other early schools followed the same plan with some minor deviations. The Benton School, for example, was constructed so that the entrances to both upper departments were located in the center of the building, thus the classrooms were placed in the corners. These early schools were arranged so that the principal teacher could oversee the large group of pupils in the room, while the assistants (according to the monitorial system) held classes in the smaller rooms adjoining.[1]

High school.--The first public high-school building in the city of St. Louis was completed during the school year ending in 1856.[2] This building was described by Tice, then superintendent of instruction, as being the most complete schoolhouse in the country. His claims were supported by the statement that in developing plans considerable study had preceded the construction. The schools of Boston had been studied for architectural advantages. Also, detailed plans were secured from the Central High School in Cincinnati, together with suggestions from the principal of that school as to possible improvements upon the plan. To this information the architect and the St. Louis teachers added their suggestions.[3]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 84-89. [2] Second Annual Report, op. cit., p. 60.

[3] John H. Tice, "Central High School," The Teacher and Western Educational Magazine, I (August, September, and October, 1853), 290.

Superintendent Tice described his building as follows:

The building in its extreme length is one hundred and six feet four inches; and extreme width eighty-four feet, that is, including tower and transepts. The body of the building is eighty-four feet by sixty-seven; main height, seventy-one feet. Front square tower, used respectively in each story for reception room, library, museum, and astronomical observatory, one hundred and six feet high. Octagonal tower flanking each corner, one hundred and two feet high; finished with ogee pinnacled roots, ornamental crockets on each angle, terminated with large foliated finials. The wings or transepts on the sides are thirteen by seventeen feet, with large gothic windows, seven by thirty-four feet, filled with tracery and with ogee crocketed hood moulding, and finial. A similar window is in the large square front tower. All the windows have large cast iron hood mouldings to be painted in imitation of stone; buttress caps, string courses, and wall copings, also of cast iron and finished in the same manner; roof covered with slate, with copper gutters. Transverse and longitudinal halls divide the first and second stories into four rooms each, and each room capable of accommodating seventy scholars. The desks are supported in an entire new style, by means of a cast iron peristyle, with large pedestal and four claws for screws; peristyle placed in the centre of the desk, adding much to the comfort, cleanliness, quiet, and free ventilation of the room. The desks are made of cherry and varnished. The chairs, which are on the arm-chair fashion, are supported similarly to desks, move on a pivot so as to turn, are quarter way round, and the iron work of both desk and chairs are neatly bronzed. Wardroom rooms in the towers are attached to each schoolroom, with hydrant, and iron sinks for washing and drinking purposes. The philosophical and chemical lecture room in the basement is sixty-one feet by thirty-one feet, with apparatus rooms in towers, with sinks and water; also, to fireplaces at each end of the room for experiments in chemistry and philosophy. The other basement is used by three furnaces for heating the building. The upper or great hall in the third story, being the full size of the building, is large and commodious, capable of accommodating six hundred persons. A large platform, twenty feet deep, and the width of the building, is at the south end of the hall, to be used by scholars on examination day, and for recitation, declamation, and reading their exercises; also for a stand for lecturers. There is a retiring room behind the platform in the front tower, for scholars to prepare themselves for performing respective parts in dialogue, etc. From this retiring room a flight of stairs ascends to the astronomical observatory. The rooms in the octagonal towers of this story are intended for committee rooms for directory, or for private conference of teachers and parents, or friends, at general exercise, or on examination day. There are two museum rooms in the second story of the transepts, one for males and the other for females. The entrance or reception room, for strangers and parents, is in the first story of the observatory, or front square tower on Olive Street. Over the reception room is the library room. Perfect and thorough ventilation is aimed at, and the latest improvements to attain it adopted. The stairs are broad and direct, giving free and easy access to and from the building at all times, and securing against all accidents in case of

alarm of fire, etc. All the finishing of the schoolrooms and halls are to be grained oak and varnished. Wardrobe rooms are to be supplied with double clothes' hooks; halls with umbrella racks, troughs, and places for overshoes, all made of cherry and varnished.[1]

Effect of Adoption of Graded System

Ira Divoll, who became superintendent of instruction in 1857, was critical of these early buildings. He found them of such an inferior character that it mattered very little what their plans of construction had been. He lamented the fact that the schools persisted in the Lancastrian type after those in charge should have been informed of the disadvantages of that type of education. His efforts resulted in the reconstruction of many of the early schools so that they could be adapted to the graded system. He stated that prior to 1857 the only attempt made in the city of St. Louis to construct a schoolhouse according to plans adapted to graded schools was in the high-school building--the one building which, in his opinion, should not have been so constructed. He characterized the high-school building as being a very imposing structure in external appearance but badly planned as to interior arrangements.[2]

Development of a School-Building Policy

Conscientious in his efforts to secure the best buildings possible, and to avoid the mistakes made in the buildings previously constructed, Superintendent Divoll visited leading city school systems for the purpose of familiarizing himself with the details of the construction of schoolhouses and other educational features. Upon his return the following recommendations concerning the development and extension of the school system were agreed upon:

1. The board's policy would be to build and own schoolhouses rather than rent unsuitable tenements.
2. Graded schools would be established, and no more built according to the old plan.
3. Schools would be built of uniform size throughout the city. Those in thinly settled areas would be built so that suitable additions could be made later.
4. Each first-class schoolhouse, for purposes of economy

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 290-93.

[2] Thirteenth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 110-11.

and good management, would contain twelve rooms accommodating about seven hundred scholars and would provide separate playgrounds and stairways for boys and girls.

5. Scholars in the future would be classified as to attainment, with primary scholars on the first floor, intermediate on the second, and the most advanced on the third.

6. Each building would contain one organization and one principal teacher.

7. Old buildings would be altered where possible and adapted to the graded system.

8. Buildings containing several independent organizations were to be consolidated under one principal.[1]

The year 1859 saw an unprecedented number of buildings erected in St. Louis.[2] These buildings were designed to accommodate over 3,400 pupils and were constructed at a total cost of $76,000. The Clay School was typical of those erected at this time. The school was erected on the corner of Bellefontaine and Farrar Streets. The building was 74.5 feet by 56 feet, with two wings 30 feet by 9 feet each. The building was three stories high and contained four rooms on each floor, each room being 30 feet by 26.5 feet. The several stories were connected by two flights of stairs, each five feet wide. Clothes rooms were located in the wings. By a special arrangement each pair of rooms on the third floor could be thrown together and made to answer the purposes of an assembly hall. Each room was ventilated by a large ventilation flue.

When completed, the Clay School accommodated the pupils of the old Clay, Fairmount Grammar, Fairmount Primary, and Natural Bridge schools. Of the four buildings in which these schools had been located, one had been built for a schoolhouse, one for a place of worship, one for a dwelling house, and one for a barroom. The larger school housed the pupils more efficiently and permitted of a better school organization.[3]

The years following the outbreak of the Civil War brought great difficulty to the schools. Schools were reduced to about one-third their former size. Some schoolhouses were closed, and tuition fees were charged the pupils in order to meet current expenses. Consequently, no new buildings were erected for a period of time.[3] However, the decade from 1857 to 1867 witnessed a funda-

---

[1] Ibid. [2] Fifth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 19.

[3] Thirteenth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 118-19.

[4] Ibid., p. 124.

mental change in the type of building construction. In the beginning of this period schools were conducted on the monitorial system and one school often contained one or more independent organizations. At the close of this period, throughout the entire public school system, there was but one organization and one principal to a building. The beneficial results from this measure were listed as follows: (1) uniformity and simplicity in all schools; (2) better classification with consequently more efficient instruction; and (3) saving in money due to larger classes and fewer principals' salaries.

The interest in the construction of school buildings manifested by Superintendent Divoll may have been due in part to the fact that in spite of a program of construction, there seemed to be a continuous need for expansion. As late as 1865 it was estimated that from fifteen hundred to two thousand applicants had been excluded from the schools because of insufficient room.[1]

Superintendent Divoll's successor, William T. Harris, likewise maintained a keen interest in school-building construction. In commenting upon the board's proficiency in school-building construction, he attributed its success to the fact that St. Louis school interests were apart from municipal direction and supported his claim by citing in comparison the lavish expenditures for school buildings in Boston, Chicago, San Francisco, Washington, Cleveland, and Philadelphia.[2]

The board's policy of renting school buildings was not to Mr. Harris' liking. He pointed out the disadvantages of such buildings from an educational standpoint and stated that within a six- or seven-year period enough money could be saved in a properly built schoolhouse to save the cost of the entire structure. He did agree that, as a temporary expedient, rented schools would suffice.[3] He listed five objections to the use of rented buildings. (1) In most rented buildings, the rooms could not accommodate more than two-thirds of the regular quota of students for teachers. This increased the per capita cost of instruction. (2) Light was generally improperly provided for in rented buildings. (3) Rented buildings were usually poorly ventilated. (4) Yard accommodations were scanty and not well adapted to the needs

---

[1] Ninth and Tenth Annual Reports, op. cit., p. 58.

[2] Fifteenth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 67. [3] Ibid., p. 68.

of the school. (5) Room interiors of rented buildings were usually depressing since they lacked good furnishings and modern appliances.[1]

He characterized a model school as follows:

> 1. It should be centrally located in the district, but at least one block off the business streets, so as not to suffer from noise. Its pupils should not be obliged to cross through avenues or railroads to reach it, as the danger to children of seven or eight years would be too much.
> 2. The lot should be large--125 by 150 feet is the minimum for a school of 700 pupils--so that the children can all find playground in the year, without danger to the primary children from the older ones, and, moreover, so that the lower story may get light through its windows without danger of being darkened by high buildings built on neighboring lots.
> 3. The schoolrooms should be 25 or 27 feet wide, and 30 or 32 feet long, and 12 to 14 feet high. These dimensions cannot be varied from without injuring the rooms in some important feature. Too large rooms require too much strain on the teacher's voice and produce throat diseases. Too small rooms render the ventilation difficult, besides preventing free manipulation of the classes. Wardrobes should join the rooms so that the pupils may pass through them into the hall when they go out.
> 4. Each room should have at least four large windows. The pupils should be so seated as to face the side of the room where there are no windows, letting the light shine in from the back or from the side. Much straining of the eyes may be thus prevented.
> 5. The halls, or passage ways, should have no nooks or recesses in which pupils may stand or play unobserved; they should, moreover, be lighted from end to end, so that a single teacher may supervise, at one glance, the whole extent. Upon the arrangement of halls and stairways depend largely the discipline of the school.
> 6. The heating and ventilation should be perfect. As this is a subject on which much variety of opinion exists, I take the liberty to discuss it further under a separate head.[2]

School-Building Construction from 1870-1910

In the four decades 1870-1910 a tremendous amount of attention was focused on the school-building program. Throughout this period it is possible to identify certain trends in the construction and reconstruction of school buildings. (1) There was a continuous effort to accommodate the pupils in a growing and expanding city population. (2) The policy to construct larger school units was developed. (3) Attention of the board began to

---

[1] Ibid., p. 69.

[2] Seventeenth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 8-9.

be focused upon considerations of the health, physical welfare, and safety of the pupils. (4) Problems arose from the rapid increase in the secondary-school population.

School Buildings for an Expanding Population

By 1880 the city's westward expansion was such that all school buildings west of Jefferson had been filled to capacity. It therefore became the duty of the board to provide additional room in this direction. In studying the situation, the superintendent recommended that the schools to be erected in the future should be twelve-room buildings which could later be increased to eighteen or twenty-four rooms.[1]

The need for new school buildings was not confined to the areas of the expanding city. Certain areas already settled were becoming more congested. For that reason it was recommended in December, 1880, that several schools needed additions to provide for overcrowded conditions. It was, in fact, the policy of the board to increase school accommodations by building additions, wherever possible, instead of establishing new school centers.[2]

Rented buildings.--In spite of the board's efforts to provide accommodations for pupils by the erection of new buildings or the construction of new additions, circumstances compelled the renting of buildings. For the school year ending 1886 the cost of rented buildings amounted to $5,231.30. These rented buildings, although the best available in the communities needing them, were undesirable. Such buildings were found always to be defective in light and ventilation, and often lacked a sufficient amount of floor space.[3]

While the population in certain areas of the city was moving outward and particular areas within the city were becoming more densely populated, other areas were being depleted of their population.[4] Efforts were made to close certain rooms in downtown schools where it appeared no longer desirable to have them located. By the end of the school year in 1896 the most serious problem con-

---

[1] Twenty-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 13.

[2] Twenty-seventh Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 37-38.

[3] Thirty-second Annual Report, op. cit., p. 14.

[4] Thirty-fifth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 20.

fronting the board was considered to be that of furnishing proper accommodations for the rapidly increasing school population. It was perhaps more serious for St. Louis than some of the other large cities because the charter had made no provision for a general appropriation or the levying of a special tax for building purposes.[1]

Double-time sessions.--In order to meet the demand for schooling of a considerable number of pupils who would have been unable to find accommodations, the board in the course of the school year 1897 provided "double-time session" for twenty-eight schoolrooms.[2] By this arrangement one group of pupils was taught during the forenoon period and another group during the afternoon period. This plan was introduced as a matter of necessity and not of choice and affected only the younger children in the school. Two teachers were provided for these "double-time sessions," one having charge of the forenoon group and the other the afternoon group. The "double-time session" was considered a makeshift arrangement and one to be abandoned at the first opportunity through a building program or by renting suitable quarters.[3] In at least one instance these sessions were eliminated in part by a redistricting of the city.[4] Also, to eliminate the need for rented rooms and "double-time sessions," the commissioner of school buildings, William B. Ittner, reported the development of a portable building.[5]

Portable schoolrooms.--By 1900 the board had twenty-five portable schoolrooms.[6] These rooms were constructed by carpenters in the school buildings department. The buildings were twenty-four feet long, thirty-six feet wide, and twelve feet in height.[7] They were constructed in sections and built upon frames which could be bolted together readily in such a manner as to make a

---

[1] Forty-second Annual Report, op. cit., p. 12.

[2] Forty-third Annual Report, op. cit., p. 19.

[3] Forty-fourth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 40-41.

[4] Forty-fifth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 48.

[5] Ibid., p. 202.

[6] Forty-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 59-60.

[7] Forty-fifth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 202-3.

very tight room. Heating and ventilation were accomplished by means of an indirect furnace with double casing. By actual test it was determined that each pupil was provided with sixteen cubic feet of fresh warm air per minute. The popularity of these rooms is indicated by the fact that the school authorities in Boston, New York, and other large cities requested working plans for the portable as developed in St. Louis.[1]

Portable buildings were found to be of special service during the early part of the twentieth century in (1) affording a means for accommodating the sudden increase in the school population occasioned by the St. Louis World's Fair, and (2) housing the pupils of the other schools in process of reconstruction and repair.[2] However, the use of portable buildings did not deter the board in its program of erecting new buildings.[3] The school year 1902-03 witnessed the greatest expenditures in the history of the board for building construction and repair. Over 26 per cent of the board's total income was spent for capital outlay.

Construction of Larger Units

A second trend during the period was the tendency to construct larger school buildings. Prior to 1880 the plans of the twelve- and eighteen-room buildings, such as the Carr Lane and Madison Schools, had come to be the acceptable pattern both from the standpoint of suitability and also that of economy.[4] By 1874 only four of the fifty-seven schools in existence had more than twelve rooms. It was believed that a twelve-room building could accommodate about as many pupils as one principal could control effectively, the number being about six hundred. The four buildings containing more than twelve rooms had only twelve regular schoolrooms. Twenty years later all of the original twelve-room schools had been enlarged. In many cases the reconstructed schools had as many as twenty-four rooms, and the policy for new buildings was to plan for an eventual size of an eighteen- or

---

[1] Forty-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 170-91.

[2] Forty-ninth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 56-57.

[3] Ibid., p. 43.

[4] Twenty-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 13-14.

twenty-four-room structure.[1] In constructing the larger buildings, the board at first followed the plan for the old twelve-room type of building and then duplicated the unit on the same lot if enrollments required. The first-class school, according to the rules of the board, was changed from the twelve-room building to one containing eighteen or more rooms.[2]

The patrons of the school, according to the report for 1893, were very much in favor of the larger school units. Advantages were claimed in favor of the larger buildings in matters of system and promotion. The plan of locating small primary schools in various sections of the school district to serve a small locality then contributing the pupils to larger central schools was practically abandoned.[3]

Attention Focused on Considerations of Security, Safety, and Physical Welfare

As early as 1883 the matter of security to school pupils occupied the attention of the board. Dangers resulting from fires had been a subject of public discussion and the matter discussed by the board. A check of the construction of buildings by the board lead to the conclusion that the danger was not so great as thought earlier.

Brick-wall construction, floorings deadened with mortar layers, and the placement of furnaces under other than hallways were considered excellent barriers to fire hazards. Stairways and halls were spacious, thereby permitting prompt and efficient passage to outside in event of emergency. The board considered the greatest hazard to be not in the matter of school construction but in the probability of panic. The doors leading from the halls into the yards were, therefore, constructed to open outward so that it would be impossible for the doors to be closed by blocking.[4]

The sanitary condition of schools was a matter of discussion in 1886 when it was stated that the condition in the

---

[1] Thirty-ninth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 34.

[2] Forty-second Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 21-22.

[3] Thirty-ninth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 34-35.

[4] Twenty-ninth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 16-17.

normal school did not answer moderate demands. The light, air, and space were all considered inadequate for the young ladies of that school.[1] Two years later an inspection by the city board of health called attention to the necessity of remedying hygienic conditions. The board, accordingly, set about to overhaul many of the schools to correct defective heating apparatus and to remedy ventilation and drainage defects. To assist in the supervision of this construction a practical builder was appointed to devote his entire time to this type of work. Consideration of sanitary conditions in connection with the construction and remodeling of school buildings became an established policy.[2]

By 1896 definite standards concerning equipment and construction of schoolrooms in relation to pupil health and hygiene were in existence for (1) size and form of rooms, (2) location of school sites, (3) floors, (4) windows and walls, (5) desks, (6) closets (toilets), (7) wraps and wardrobes, and (8) stairs.[3] Further, the ordinances of the city concerning the requirements for fireproof buildings were being met. New buildings had bearing walls of brick; floors and roofs were of concrete or tile and metal. All downspouts and gutters were of fireproof material. Stairways were made of iron and slate.[4]

New buildings were planned for the steam fan or plenum system. Under such a plan, a positive flow of pure warm air into each room supplemented an outflow of the same quantity of vitiated air. Each pupil was provided with thirty cubic feet of air per minute, and the entire air of the room was changed every seven minutes.[5]

Other improvements made at this time were of plumbing defects, provision of drinking fountains for yards and buildings, and construction of new and modern outhouses. The janitors were instructed in the care of the new buildings with special consideration being given the sanitary conditions.[6]

---

[1] Thirty-second Annual Report, op. cit., p. 51.

[2] Thirty-fifth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 21.

[3] Forty-second Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 23-28.

[4] Forty-fourth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 178.

[5] Ibid., p. 177.

[6] Ibid., p. 180.

Housing for Increasing Secondary-School Population

The need for a new high-school building had become so acute by 1884 that the alumni association of the original public high school in St. Louis began to demand additional high-school accommodations. They pointed out that at the time the first high school had been built only one hundred and twenty pupils were in attendance, and that by 1868 the building was so crowded that basement rooms were used for instruction rooms.[1] The main hall, also, was divided into classrooms, thus depriving students of an assembly hall. Conditions became so crowded that it was necessary to carry on high-school work in two different buildings.[2] In response to a petition presented by prominent citizens requesting better high-school accommodations, a committee was appointed by the board to consider the demand.[3] A lot 193 feet by 380 feet on Grand Avenue in block 2291 was purchased by action of the board in 1886 and plans made to secure drawings for a new high-school building.[4] Bids on plans and specifications were received and work was begun on the new building by making excavations and laying foundations. Certain new board members elected for the following year did not believe that the selection of the high-school site had been a fortunate one and, due to certain policies of retrenchment, nothing was done to advance construction of the building.[5] Likewise, the school board for the year 1888-89 found it impossible to proceed with the plans originally adopted.[6] However, the board for the school year ending June 30, 1891, found it possible to continue the erection of the new high-school building on the location originally secured, a location which they found highly desirable because of its accessibility to all parts of the city.[7]

---

[1] Thirtieth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 73.

[2] Thirty-third Annual Report, op. cit., p. 77.

[3] Ibid., pp. 87-88.

[4] Official Proceedings, op. cit., V (April 13, 1886), 554-55.

[5] Thirty-fourth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 29-30.

[6] Thirty-fifth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 29.

[7] Thirty-seventh Annual Report, op. cit., p. 12.

The report of the superintendent for the school year 1900 indicates that the problem of high-school accommodations was a continuing one. He reported that the small high-school enrollment for white pupils in St. Louis could be accounted for in part by the inconvenience and expense in having to travel to the one high school available. The reason for the crowded condition was the fact that for years the school board, because of limited financial means, had been forced to give inadequate support to either the high-school population or to the development of the district schools. The support of the district school had been maintained to the consequent detriment of the high school.[1]

In deciding upon a solution of the high-school problem, the board purchased in 1901 the site for a high school to accommodate the south side and in 1902 purchased one for the north side. Contracts were let for $285,957.00 and $307,766.00, respectively.[2] Both of these high schools were constructed and equipped to provide curriculums for purely literary training, manual training, or domestic science, and any such combination of subjects as might be approved to suit the needs of students. The plans submitted for these buildings was the result of much planning and research on the part of both the superintendent of instruction and the commissioner of school buildings.

These schools, while differing in architectural appearance, were similar in interior arrangement. The main building was constructed three stories high with a well-lighted basement. The center portion of the building was carried four stories for architectural appearance and to obtain one additional room. Shops were located in one-story wings inclosing two courts. On the first floor were located the reception room, the principal's office, the auditorium, a classroom, science laboratories, and storage space. Manual-training facilities included those for girls as well as for boys.

The second floor was designed to house ten classrooms. These rooms were arranged to permit the teacher to hear class recitations as well as to supervise the class at study, thus eliminating the necessity for study halls. A large reference room was also located in the second story. The third floor con-

---

[1] Forty-eighth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 79.

[2] Ibid., pp. 80-81.

tained six additional classrooms, a freehand drawing room, a room equipped for classes in business and banking, a large room for shorthand and typewriting, as well as one for photography. The central portion of the building was carried up in the form of a tower and provided a large mechanical-drawing room with additional storerooms and a blueprinting room.

General locker and toilet rooms for each sex were located in the basement rooms. The basement also contained a lunchroom, gymnasium, and showers for both boys and girls. All parts of the building were adequately lighted and planned with sufficient toilet facilities and locker rooms in various parts of the building. The cost of the building was less than that of the original school in spite of the fireproof construction and increased efficiency of the new building.[1]

In 1908 another high school was begun.[2] As a working basis for his plans for the building, the commissioner of school buildings accepted the recommendations of the superintendent of instruction who had contacted the various high-school principals for the purpose of studying the practical needs for the building. The high school, when completed, was considered to be a building of great architectural beauty with practical adaptations to its purposes. The building opened as the Soldan High School in September, 1909.[3]

In appraising the high-school accommodations for white students in St. Louis, the Beaumont, Cleveland, Roosevelt, and Southwest buildings were rated in 1939 as being superior. The Vashon High School for Negroes was the only building for colored students which was rated superior. The Central High School was given a fair rating, and the three other buildings for whites and one for colored were rated as being good.[4]

Findings of the Strayer Survey

In his survey made of the public schools of St. Louis in 1937, Strayer listed the following characteristics of school

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 173-78.

[2] Fifty-fourth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 89.

[3] Fifty-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 116.

[4] Strayer, op. cit., pp. 407-9.

buildings as excellent:

1. The buildings are substantially built.
2. Architectural design is attractive.
3. Safety and sanitation features are emphasized.
4. Excellent features for lighting and ventilation are present in the majority of buildings.
5. Classrooms are adequate in size and possess desirable appointments. Kindergartens are among the most attractive to be found anywhere.
6. Features tending to make for greater human comfort have had thoughtful attention.
7. Efforts in recent years to provide adequate sites are commendable.

The outstanding faults were listed as follows:

1. Post-planning has emphasized good construction and design with too little attention to educational needs.
2. Less promise is shown in present school-building programs than was shown at the beginning of the century.
3. Educational authorities have too minor a part in planning of school buildings.
4. Excessive space is found in many corridors, stair wells, and in provisions for ventilating and heating.
5. The most desirable space as well as too much space is taken by heating and ventilating systems.
6. Space allotted educational administrative officers is inadequate.
7. Too much space is placed below ground level or in basements.
8. Gymnasiums and playrooms are frequently placed so that they are not fully open to fresh air and sunlight.
9. Auditoriums in elementary schools are not planned well for either child or community needs.
10. The emphasis placed on kindergarten rooms overshadows that placed on other special rooms in elementary schools.
11. A stereotyped educational program is indicated by the great amount of blackboard space with little attention given to bulletin-board space and other modern pupil and teacher equipment.
12. Although the matter of safety has been emphasized, there are too few facilities for fire alarm and fire control.
13. Toilet facilities are too often confined to basement regions of the building.
14. Teachers' rooms are inadequate.
15. Too many instances of poor lighting are present in schoolrooms.
16. Educational and architectural authorities have not developed a definite program for improving color scheme throughout the buildings.
17. Scientific use of acoustical materials not used sufficiently to eliminate unnecessary noises in many buildings.
18. Wide corridors have not been planned for educational uses.
19. Play areas have been reduced to a minimum on small sites.
20. Play space and physical apparatus for play are insufficient.
21. Children in certain sections of the city are attending

school in old, poorly planned buildings.

22. Buildings constructed before 1900 lack facilities of modern buildings.

23. School-building facilities are too uniform throughout the city. Individual needs of differing localities have been overlooked.[1]

Following the survey report in 1939, there is some evidence that the board has given serious consideration to improving some of the objectionable features of its school-building program. In reporting for the year 1945, the president of the board stated that a break had been made in traditional housing practices. New emphasis was placed on constructing houses which would meet the needs of the educational program, rather than on what best suited the landscape and the convenience of architectural and engineering construction.

To support the statement of the changed policy, the example of the L'Overture Branch School was cited. That building was constructed of light-weight steel frame, completely sheathed in a variety of asbestos cement boards, the entire building being bolted together. This type of construction made it possible to demount and salvage the building if future needs warrant a change. Although the plan for the building was described as conventional, it was stated that certain fundamental features were included for purposes of experimentation and consideration for future construction. The experimental features listed were: larger classrooms, various combinations of day and artificial light, and various finishes to secure proper acoustics. Features proving desirable, according to the president's report are to be used in future buildings.[2] According to the new policy as described, the board committed itself to a plan of building construction which would be both flexible and dynamic, with proper attention given to the present and future needs of the educational program.

School-Building Program from 1910-1940

Table 2 shows the number of school units and the enrollment of each unit for selected years during the three decades beginning with 1910 and ending in 1940. In each case the figures shown are

---

[1] Strayer, op. cit., pp. 409-13.

[2] Ninety-first Annual Report, op. cit., p. 18.

TABLE 2

NUMBER OF SCHOOL UNITS AND ENROLLMENT FOR SELECTED YEARS DURING THE PERIOD, 1900-1940[a]

	1909-10		1919-20		1929-30		1939-40	
	Number	Enrollment	Number	Enrollment	Number	Enrollment	Number	Enrollment
White teachers' college	1	113	1	165	1	241	1	728
Colored teachers' college	...	...	...	...	1	196	1	342
Total	1	113	1	165	2	437	2	1,070
White high schools	4	4,497	5	8,081	5	12,728	8	19,054
Colored high schools	1	326	1	888	2	11,919	2	3,114
White vocational schools	...	...	...	...	1	1,028	1	2,604
Colored vocational schools	...	...	...	...	1	190	1	483
Junior high schools	...	...	1	1,372	...	...	...	...
Pre-vocational schools	...	...	...	...	1	30	...	...
Total	5	4,823	7	10,341	10	15,895[b]	12	25,255
White elementary schools								
Intermediate	...	...	...	...	4	2,685	...	...
Regular	87	60,759	91	63,403	94	65,835	96	55,576
Special	6	219	19	962	22	1,397	25	1,292
Colored elementary schools								
Intermediate	...	...	...	...	2	1,846	...	...
Regular	9	4,258	14	7,490	12	10,748	22	16,093
Special	1	29	3	70	8	429	9	478
Total	103	65,265	127	71,925	140	82,940	152	73,440
Grand Total	109	70,201	135	82,431	156	99,272	166	99,765

[a]Sources: Fifty-sixth Annual Report, Sixty-sixth Annual Report, Seventy-sixth Annual Report, and Eighty-sixth Annual Report.

[b]This figure contains those in the high-school grades of elementary schools.

those given for the close of the year as secured from the annual reports. An examination of the table will indicate some of the problems which had to be met by the board during that period.

Accommodations for increased high-school enrollment.--It will be noted that the total number of secondary-school pupils increased from 4,823 in 1910 to 25,255 in 1940. During the same period the board increased the number of buildings accommodating secondary-school pupils from five to twelve. Of the five buildings listed for 1910, one was for Negroes and four were for white pupils. By 1940 there were eight high schools for whites and two for Negroes.

The great increase in the number of high-school students had, by 1921, brought about a condition where each of the high schools was housing from 40 to 60 per cent more students than the buildings were designed to accommodate.[1] The situation was partially relieved by adding periods of instruction to the school day in order to take care of extra students. For a time the board was undecided as to whether to increase the number of intermediate schools or the number of senior high schools. The board decided to construct two new high-school buildings. The Roosevelt was completed in 1925[2] and the Beaumont in 1926.[3] These two schools were described as being the finest of their kind throughout the country.

During the period of the depression, high-school enrollment increased very rapidly.[4] As shown by Table 2, the enrollment during the school year ending 1930 was 15,895 and by 1940 was 25,255. To relieve the crowded situation in the high schools, the intermediate schools became senior high schools and the seventh and eighth grades were restored to the elementary buildings. The table indicates that the total elementary enrollment declined from 82,940 in 1930 to 73,440 in 1940. This made it possible to house the ninth grade in many of the elementary schools. Twenty-one ninth-grade centers were opened and the extensive construction of new high-school buildings was postponed. That the

---

[1] Sixty-seventh Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 11-12.

[2] Sixty-eighth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. xviii-xix.

[3] Seventy-second Annual Report, op. cit., p. 10.

[4] Eighty-second Annual Report, op. cit., p. 24.

movement toward ninth-grade centers was more or less temporary is shown by the fact that when the Southwest High School opened in September, 1937, it was possible to close some of the ninth-grade centers.[1]

Accommodations for handicapped elementary children.--Table 2 shows that the number of elementary pupils increased from 65,265 in 1910 to 73,440 in 1940, and that the total number of elementary units increased from 103 to 152. There was a decline, however, in elementary-school enrollment from 1930 to 1940 in the amount of 9,500. This decline was more noticeable in the white elementary enrollment than in the colored enrollment. The number of elementary units for whites in 1910 was 87 and by 1940 was 96. During the same period, the number of units for colored increased from 9 to 22.

A part of the increase in the number of elementary units during this period was due to the provision of special schools for handicapped children. At the beginning of the period there were six special schools for whites and one for Negroes. At the close of the period, there were twenty-five special schools for whites and nine for Negroes. Thus, the total number of special schools increased from seven to thirty-four during the period.

One of the special schools established during this period was the Elias Michael school for handicapped white children. Plans for the building were presented in 1925. The school was described by the building commissioner as follows:

> The plans presented contemplate a one-story building and contain eight classrooms, a kindergarten room, assembly room with a stage, domestic science, a lunchroom and kitchen, a restroom, a shop, principal's office and supply room, and rooms for corrective therapeutics as follows:
> Isolation room, dental clinic, dressing room, tub room, general clinic, nurses and physicians room, mechano therapeutics room, plaster room, corrective-exercise room, room for wheel chairs, together with the necessary general toilets for boys and girls; necessary storage rooms, and space for heating and ventilating apparatus, flues, etc.[2]

The Turner School was constructed for physically handicapped colored children.[3] The Gallaudet School, constructed in

---

[1] Eighty-third Annual Report, op. cit., p. 20.

[2] Seventy-first Annual Report, op. cit., p. 303.

[3] Eightieth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 38.

1925, was built for the accommodation of deaf children. Schools for mentally handicapped were also organized. By 1934 the board of education had provided accommodations for thirteen of these special schools.[1]

Accommodations for vocational pupils.--As shown in Table 2, no schools for the specific purpose of providing vocational opportunities for high-school students were in operation prior to 1929. During the late twenties, the board of education became interested in the new problem of vocational education. Visits were made by the board to several large cities including Cleveland, Pittsburgh, Toronto, and Detroit, for the purpose of studying vocational schools.[2] While the board had established a vocational school for whites in temporary quarters, it was not until November 2, 1931, that the new Hadley Vocational School opened for school purposes.[3] The building was designed primarily for industrial shops but was versatile enough to be used for other purposes as well.[4]

The vocational school for colored children was opened in September, 1929, in a building which was formerly used as a white elementary school. It was reconstructed to provide for instruction in a number of trades and vocations.[5]

Wider use of school buildings.--One other activity of the board of education during the period from 1910 to 1940 in the administration of school buildings is worthy of attention. By 1912 the board sought by constitutional amendment to remove the restriction on spending its funds for any persons except those between the ages of six and twenty. This was done to give an additional year of schooling and to permit the wider use of the school buildings.[6]

By 1920 these restrictions had been removed and the board adopted a policy with respect to the wider use of the school plant as described in the following statements:

> The public school buildings may be opened after regular hours free to individuals or organizations for such purposes

---

[1] Ibid. [2] Seventy-fifth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 7.

[3] Seventy-seventh Annual Report, op. cit., p. 187.

[4] Ibid., p. 10.

[5] Seventy-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 20.

[6] Fifty-eighth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 14.

> as have a distinctly educational value, whenever the Commissioner of School Buildings approves and is able to provide the necessary conditions of light, heat, and janitor service. The question of whether a proposed use of school buildings has an educational value shall be determined by the Superintendent of Instruction.
>
> Application for the use of any school building for other than regular school purposes must be made to the Supervisor of Educational Extension.[1]

The board, in evaluating its own policy with respect to the use of buildings in other cities, reported that St. Louis was the only city in the country that undertook to grant the free use of its school buildings to any and all individuals or organizations for purposes having distinctly educational value. Other cities were reported to be charging fees for the purpose of reimbursing the treasuries of the boards of education for the necessary expenses of light, heat, and janitor service in the use of its school buildings by persons outside the school organization.[2]

The board has continued to encourage the wider use of school buildings by the community. During the year ending June 30, 1945, the board reported that public groups devoted to education, recreation, and other civic interests had held 9,103 meetings with a total attendance, after school hours, of 1,058,236 persons. The $34,489.10 spent by the board for this service represented an increase over the previous year in the amount of $11,315.34.[3]

---

[1] Sixty-seventh Annual Report, op. cit., p. 111. [2] Ibid.

[3] Ninety-first Annual Report, op. cit., p. 23.

CHAPTER VIII

FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION

The effort to provide school accommodations and adequate instruction in a rapidly growing city with an expanding educational program constitutes an important part of the study of the development of school administration in the city of St. Louis. Establishing a source of income for the schools actually began with the act of Congress in 1812 when certain lands were set aside for the support of schools. These lands laid the basis for the establishing of the board's permanent fund. This source was supplemented very early by the efforts of the city itself to support education. Raising money, however, is only a part of the study of financial administration. Management of the revenue received and control of expenditures are matters of equal importance and will be considered in this study.

The financial history of the St. Louis schools will be shown by (1) an account of the part which land grants have played, (2) a study of the city's tax levies, (3) a report of miscellaneous sources, and (4) a description of the efforts of the board in management of receipts and expenditures.

Lands Set Aside for School Purposes

The act of Congress, on June 13, 1812, was the first step in establishing a source for the public support of schools.[1] Any action for support arising from that act, however, necessitated the designation of certain lands to be out-lots, common field lots, and commons. This was not done at the time of the passage of the act. On January 30, 1817, the legislature of the territory of Missouri passed an act to incorporate a board of trustees for superintending the schools of St. Louis. Members were appointed and to this group the city is indebted for the preservation of lands donated by Congress.[2] In 1817 the board leased certain lands for

---

[1] First Annual Report, op. cit., p. 38. [2] Ibid., pp. 43-44.

a nominal sum so as to have possession of them.[1]

By 1865 the quota of land donated by the act of 1812 had been filled and no further accessions of land from that act were to be expected. At that time the value of lands held for revenue purposes was estimated on the books at $1,855,568.16. The revenue accruing from these lands for the year ending August 1, 1864, was $35,345.43. This amount of revenue was considered sufficient for providing the schoolhouses needed. The board had adopted the policy of using this revenue for the sole purpose of buying new sites and erecting new schoolhouses.[2]

Leasing of lands.--On February 13, 1833, the "Board of President and Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools" was incorporated. The board attempted to identify all tracts of land ceded to the board and met with considerable difficulty.[3] Supplementary to the act establishing the city of St. Louis a corporation for the purpose of education, was an act which made it lawful for the board to lend the money arising from the sale or lease of lands placed under their charge. The loans were to be for periods not to exceed one year, on good security, at a rate not to exceed 10 per cent per annum.[4]

The board took possession of the property on Market and Chestnut Streets, and Block 65 and a part of Block 69. These parcels of land were leased for fifty years. Other parcels were also leased or sold. By 1848 the lands in the United States Survey Number 3003 were leased.[5]

All leasing of school lands, until 1846, had been by public auction. In that year the board for some unexplained reason substituted private leasing. The system of private leasing was deplored by Superintendent Tice, who believed that the public auction afforded better advantages for leasing and obtained speedier disposition of lands remaining. Under the system of private leasing, many lands remained for years without producing any revenue.[6]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 45.

[2] Ninth and Tenth Annual Reports, op. cit., p. 7.

[3] Ibid., p. 46.

[4] Twenty-first Annual Report, op. cit., pp. vii-viii.

[5] First Annual Report, op. cit., p. 49. [6] Ibid., p. 64.

At the time the Fourth Annual Report was made, it was stated that nine-tenths of the net assets of the board was in real estate valued at approximately two millions of dollars. About five-sixths of the real estate was held for revenue purposes, and one-sixth appropriated for school purposes. Of the real estate held for revenue purposes, two-thirds of it had been leased and one-third still remained unproductive. The revenue was less than might have been expected, due to leases made for excessive periods and at poor rates.[1]

Mismanagement of lands.--The board continued to pursue their claims to school lands donated for school purposes by Congress. Regular and connected surveys were made of vacant lots in and about St. Louis. The evidence shows, however, that there was mismanagement in selling and leasing lands. The legislature, therefore, passed an act which prohibited any person interested in the purchase or lease of any lands held by the board from holding membership on the board.

Before these restrictions were imposed, board members often were elected who were interested in the claims under which speculators had seized the school lands. Prospective board members would often move into wards where vacancies were to occur for the purpose of becoming members, and until this act went into effect, these members seemed destined to get control of the board. However, much damage had already been done. Had the act been passed earlier, many valuable parcels of land would have been saved for the schools.[2]

In 1836 the citizens voted for a proposition to sell the commons. At the same election, the citizens voted to appropriate 10 per cent of the net proceeds of the sale to the establishing and support of the public schools. At the time of making his report, for the year ending in 1854, however, Superintendent Tice reported that up to the first of July of that year, the board had received less than $15,000, and that the income to the schools had been only about $300.[3]

By 1875 a debt of half a million dollars had been created by the board for the purchase of real estate and buildings for school purposes. The rate of interest paid by the board was 8 per

---

[1] Fourth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 111-12.

[2] First Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 49-51. [3] Ibid., p. 42.

cent, which was double the amount of income being received from its real estate. The board, therefore, adopted the policy of selling whatever property would bring a fair market price. The proceeds obtained from these sales was invested in an interest-bearing sinking fund to pay the bonded debt which had been created.[1]

The rapid growth of the school population in the decade 1870-80 increased the demands for school accommodations and revenues for operating the schools. The question arose as to whether the board should sell real estate and appropriate the proceeds for lots for school purposes. To pursue the policy of selling real estate for such purchases meant that the need for higher tax rates would be diminished for the time being, but also meant that future revenue sources would be diminished. Lands were sold in the amount of $116,803 by 1878 and the proceeds used for school purposes.[2]

Legislative restrictions.--The action of the board in selling these lands was followed in 1879 by the passage of an act by the general assembly which directed that only the income of lands held by the board and derived from the state or federal government might be used for school purposes. If such lands were sold, no part of the proceeds could be spent for the purchase of school sites or the construction of school buildings. The purpose of the act was to create and preserve a permanent public school fund. The act, therefore, necessitated the use of money obtained from current income in purchase of school sites and erection of school buildings.[3]

While the board expressed agreement in the principle of maintaining a permanent revenue-producing fund, some doubt existed as to the wisdom of the act inasmuch as it was construed to be a limitation upon the board's power to exchange unimproved, and in some cases unproductive real estate for locations which would benefit both present and future generations. It was pointed out that the board had spent, within a ten-year period, an amount approximating a million dollars for buildings and lots, an expendi-

---

[1] Twenty-first Annual Report, op. cit., p. 9.

[2] Twenty-fourth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 8-9.

[3] Twenty-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 14.

ture beneficial to the public schools and which would benefit the city in the years to come.

The board, reporting for the year 1881, stated that the policy of preserving the integrity of the permanent school fund had been established by the constitution and that the act of 1879 had merely removed doubts as to the status of the government land grants which made up the greater part of the fund.[1]

The undisputed sources of income from this fund in 1881 were described as follows:

> 1. All moneys, stocks, bonds, lands, and other property belonging to the county school fund of the former county of St. Louis, at the date of the adoption of the constitution of 1875, and all fines, forfeitures and penalties, and proceeds of estrays, as also all moneys paid for exemption from military duty collected since the adoption of said constitution.
> 2. All real estate derived from the United States or state in possession of the Board on August 16, 1879 (under act of legislature of May 16, 1879).
> 3. All proceeds of sales of above named real estate made since August 16, 1879.[2]

The permanent fund.--The proceeds from the sales of real estate, derived from the state and from the Federal Government and made prior to the act of 1879, were credited to the building fund instead of to the permanent fund.[3] Previous boards, by this action, subjected themselves to some critical comment. The board in 1881 considered the permanent fund to be tremendously important in creating future revenues and believed that the failure of former boards to preserve the fund had been a great mistake.

The need for wise use of these lands was keenly felt because of the feeling that previous boards had not maintained them properly. The example of Chicago in preserving and using government school lands was pointed to as one worthy of study. It was pointed out that valuable improvements on land in the heart of that city had been made because of that board's policy of granting long leases with the policy of revaluation every five years. The argument that leases on unimproved property would induce inferior improvements could not be substantiated in the light of Chicago's experience. The board's policy of leasing in St. Louis was, therefore, considered to be in need of change.

---

[1] Twenty-seventh Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 14-15.

[2] Ibid., pp. 121-22. [3] Ibid., pp. 122-23.

Since neither the grants of the general government nor the charter of the board prohibited the use of funds received in the sales of lands, no attempt was made formerly to preserve the capital of these funds.[1] The sixteenth-section land had been sold in the amount of $369,000 and the fund greatly impaired thereby. Furthermore, these lands had been among those with preferred locations. Other lands were leased for long terms at nominal rents. In order to set things in better order, all leased and unleased lands were studied for the purpose of obtaining better revenue yields and more judicious investment of revenues.[2]

By August 1, 1884, the condition of the permanent fund was listed as follows:

Cash in Treasury	$ 61,039.15
45 Missouri state bonds.	45,000.00
Premium paid for same.	3,010.00
4 U.S. 4 per cent bonds.	400.00
Premium paid for same.	19.00
Total cash and bonds.	$ 109,468.15
Bills receivable	13,884.00
Real estate for revenue purposes over.	1,000,000.00
Grand total	$1,013,884.05[3]

It will be noted that the greater portion of this fund was invested in real estate. By this time this investment was described as becoming more valuable as a means of providing revenue by virtue of the renewals of expiring leases at higher rates. Since the proceeds from the sale of these lands were to be reinvested in government bonds or in other suitable securities, the board retained the lands since there was greater chance of their values being enhanced than there was in other securities becoming more valuable.

To the permanent fund, the board in 1888 added $105,524.80 which had been realized from the sale of several valuable parcels of land not obtained from the state or the Federal Government.[4] Also added to the fund was the further sum of $64,444.00 which had accumulated in the building fund. The board at this time did adopt

---

[1] Ibid., p. 13.

[2] Twenty-eighth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 18.

[3] Thirtieth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 14.

[4] Thirty-fourth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 18-19.

the plan of disposing of certain nonrevenue-bearing properties for the purpose of securing funds for a new board of education building located at Ninth and Locust Streets.[1] In addition to providing offices for the board of education, the four lower stories and the basement were designed to be rented for business purposes. The policy of selling the board's unproductive property was designed to improve the future finances of the board, since the sale would not only add money to the treasury but also would permit the purchaser to improve the property, thereby increasing the taxable property of the future. The first public auction under this plan was very successful and resulted in the sale of unimproved property on Evans and Page Avenues for the aggregate sum of $103,688.71.[2]

By 1899 the board's real-estate holdings had a value of approximately $1,400,000, which provided an income of approximately 6 per cent of that amount.[3] The board of education building had not, however, provided the amount of income anticipated at the time of its construction. By 1900, however, practically all space in the new building had been rented at a fair income.[4]

Change in leasing policy.--By 1910 considerable dissatisfaction had arisen concerning the lands owned by the board. The method of leasing had made future charges so uncertain as to cause the lessees to be unwilling to improve the property to the point where a profitable income could be realized by the board. Under the policy of leasing, the terms varied from ten years to perpetuity, the lessee being required to pay as rental 6 per cent upon a valuation which was to be readjusted by arbitration every ten years, as well as being required to pay all general and special taxes assessed against the property.[5]

In view of these facts, the board in January, 1908, formally committed itself to the policy of disposing of these lands under the most advantageous conditions possible.[6] The board was

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 11-12.

[2] Thirty-fifth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 25.

[3] Forty-fifth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 15.

[4] Forty-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 219.

[5] Fifty-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 17.

[6] Official Proceedings, op. cit., XV (January 14, 1908), 280-82.

required to invest the proceeds from the sale of such lands, according to the constitution of the state of Missouri, in bonds of the city of St. Louis, state of Missouri, or United States Government. By June 30, 1940, the board of education's permanent fund had $19,561.28 cash in the treasury, and securities in bonds with face value amounting to $2,797,400.00.[1] The bond investments of the permanent fund for 1945 had a par value of $3,137,200.00, and the largest major parcel of property remaining in this fund was the board's administration building.[2]

Revenue through Taxation

The principal source of revenue for the operation of schools throughout their history has been that which has resulted from taxation. In 1849 the people voted by a large majority to approve a tax of one-tenth of 1 per cent per annum to be assessed and collected for educational purposes. This tax was collected for the first time in 1850 and amounted to $18,432.[3] By 1856 this method of raising money was considered to be highly acceptable to the community since the public schools had been made so popular.[4] The principle of taxation for the support of public schools was well established in the years following, as evidenced by the increase of the tax of two-tenths of 1 per cent by 1856, to three-tenths in 1867, and to four-tenths in 1868.[5]

Objection to principle of taxation.--There were forces in the community, however, which opposed the principle of taxation on the grounds that the public schools were established for poor people not able to pay tuition, and that wealthy people were not patronizing them.[6] Friends of the parochial schools also felt that the revenues should be divided with them as they contributed to the welfare of the poor by providing orphan asylums, hospitals, almshouses, and schools. These forces, however, were not success-

---

[1] Eighty-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 127.

[2] Ninety-first Annual Report, op. cit., p. 136.

[3] First Annual Report, op. cit., p. 42.

[4] Second Annual Report, op. cit., p. 69.

[5] Twenty-first Annual Report, op. cit., p. 175.

[6] Fifteenth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 21.

ful in their efforts.[1] Whereas in 1850 the amount raised by taxation was less than one-half the total amount expended for public education, by 1870 it amounted to two-thirds, and by 1872 to six-sevenths. By 1877 the board had utilized a provision of the new state constitution by levying a tax of one mill in addition to the four-mill tax for the purpose of paying debts created before the adoption of the constitution. One-fifth of the school district's income, or approximately $150,000, was therefore set apart to reduce the principal and pay the interest on the debt.[2]

The indebtedness of the district at the time of the adoption of the new constitution was $754,000.[3] The levy of one mill in addition to the regular four mills for current expenses was levied for two years. From 1877 to 1881, inclusive, one-half mill was levied, and for 1882 three-tenths, this being the last levy contemplated by the board for that purpose. The current revenue receipts for the year 1882 exceeded the expenditures for that year by over $100,000. This balance was used in school-building construction, together with funds realized from assets of the building fund. The board henceforth adopted the policy of a "pay-as-you-go" plan for construction of buildings.[4]

Need for additional tax.--For the next twenty years, the board labored with some difficulty to support the schools and carry on a building program with the current income, the tax rate being the authorized four mills.[5] By 1900 the board felt a definite need for levying additional taxes, in spite of the fact that a merchant's tax had been affirmed by the supreme court of the state and fixed at the regular four-mill rate by the legislature in 1893.[6] The income which would accrue from the levy of one additional mill was calculated to be sufficient to (1) furnish free books throughout the grades; (2) provide domestic science in the course of study through the higher grades; (3) furnish addi-

---

[1] Eighteenth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 9.

[2] Twenty-third Annual Report, op. cit., p. 6.

[3] Twenty-eighth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 11.

[4] Ibid., pp. 33-34.

[5] Forty-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 34-35.

[6] Fortieth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 10-11.

tional teachers needed in the graded schools; and (4) supply teachers for the new high schools. The levy of a second mill would permit (1) the building and equipment of new high schools, (2) the adding of new district school buildings as needed, and (3) the reconstruction of worn-out, uncomfortable, unsafe, and unsanitary buildings.[1]

In support of the desire for additional income, it was pointed out that no city in the state of Missouri employing more than sixteen teachers in its school system had been able to maintain schools on a four-mill tax rate. In other cities special taxes and bond issues had been approved to properly maintain the schools. In comparison to the forty cents levied on the hundred dollars in St. Louis, Kansas City had levied eighty cents.[2]

Through the adoption by the voters of the city and the state of the amendment to the constitution authorizing the board to increase its levy from the former limit of four mills to six mills, the board was enabled to meet some of the increased demands for school expenditures.[3] However, only one additional mill was requested in 1903, one and a half additional for 1904,[4] and by 1908 the maximum amount of sixty cents on each one hundred dollars of assessed valuation was requested.[5]

By 1919 the board found it impossible to operate under the current tax rate. On November 11 of that year, a special election was held for the purpose of levying an additional tax of fifteen cents on the hundred dollars.[6] The tax was approved and the necessary funds for maintaining the schools for the year were assured. The total tax rate, therefore, became seventy-five cents on the one hundred dollars valuation on the property. This rate was increased to eighty-five cents for the year ending in 1921.[7]

An act of the legislature in Missouri in 1921 authorized

---

[1] Forty-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 37.

[2] Ibid., pp. 363-64.

[3] Forty-ninth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 10.

[4] Fiftieth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 9.

[5] Fifty-fourth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 11-12.

[6] Sixty-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 29.

[7] Sixty-seventh Annual Report, op. cit., p. 13.

the establishment of the school tax rate by the people for a period of four years instead of the one-year period formerly authorized. In order to secure a sufficiently high tax rate to operate during the four-year period, the board organized a campaign of publicity and secured the passage of an eighty-five-cent rate for the four-year period beginning in 1922.[1] Quadrennial elections were held in 1926,[2] 1930,[3] 1934,[4] and 1938[5] to maintain the rate of eighty-five cents. The quadrennial election held for the year 1942 resulted in an authorization of a tax rate for the next period at eighty-nine cents.[6]

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, receipts for current taxes amounted to $8,060,542.07; payments on delinquent taxes, $837,741.23; and merchant's and manufacturer's taxes, $858,055.55; and surplus commissions, $11,853.24. Of the total receipts of $11,311,150.08, the city, therefore, supplied through taxation a total of $9,768,180.98, or approximately 86 per cent of the total.[7]

Bond issues authorized.--Shortly after 1880 and prior to 1916, the board had been able to purchase school sites and erect suitable buildings out of its income.[8] However, an urgent need for additional housing accommodations and an insufficient available income compelled the board to request the people for an authorization to borrow $3,000,000. The authorization was given by a two-thirds majority vote on November 11, 1916. The first issue of these bonds became due January 1, 1937, and the payment was made at its maturity date.[9] This payment was made without increasing the tax levy for bond-service purposes.

---

[1] Sixty-eighth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. xii-xiii.

[2] Seventy-second Annual Report, op. cit., p. 11.

[3] Seventy-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 10.

[4] Eightieth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 7.

[5] Eighty-fourth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, 1938, p. 11.

[6] Eighty-eighth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 74.

[7] Eighty-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 74.

[8] Sixty-third Annual Report, op. cit., p. 29.

[9] Eighty-third Annual Report, op. cit., p. 10.

The second bond issue in the history of the St. Louis public schools was approved on May 15, 1934, by the voters of the city, and bonds in the amount of $2,000,000 were authorized. The bonds were issued and dated August 1, 1934, bearing an interest rate of 3 per cent per annum, maturing at regular intervals over a period extending from 1940 to 1954. This amount was supplemented to the extent of $336,538.72 by the Public Works Administration of the Federal Government to assist in the board's building program.[1]

For the year ending in 1945, the outstanding bonded indebtedness in St. Louis amounted to only $1,375,000.00. It is rather significant that the indebtedness of the district amounted to less than 2 per cent of its legal debt limit.

Other Sources of Income

In addition to receipts from the permanent fund derived from land grants and local taxation, revenues accruing from tuition fees and state appropriations have been important in financing the schools. These sources will be considered briefly.

Tuition fees.--Because of the embarrassment of the board in the matter of finances, tuition fees were established at the opening of the first schools in 1838. Pupils were required, before being admitted, to pay a fee of $2.50 per quarter. Superintendent Tice reported that this requirement constituted an almost fatal error in a community where the terms "public school" and "charity school" were practically synonymous. Provision was made to admit students who could prove their inability to pay the fee. As a result, almost no scholars entered. The tuition fees were then lowered successively to $1.50, to $1.00, and finally to $0.50. In 1847 the fees were completely abolished.

This action did not meet the approval of all the forces in the community. Some held that admitting all pupils free would result in the filling of the schools with the lowest classes, thereby driving out the better classes. In such a situation the schools would become no better than the "ragged schools" of European cities. Those who approved the plan held that any system of tuition would automatically divide the school into paying and nonpaying groups. The nonpaying pupils would become ostracized and consequently would not attend.[2]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 168. [2] First Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 60-61.

The year 1861-62 became known as "the year of calamity" in the history of the public schools.[1] Little attention was given to matters of education by the public because of the conditions of war. The board, therefore, found it necessary to impose a tuition charge, sufficient to pay the teachers' salaries, but in such an amount as to be easily borne by the parents. Free tuition was accorded orphans unable to pay, children of indigent widows and indigent invalid parents unless they forfeited their right to attendance by misconduct or irregular attendance.[2] Rates were established for normal and high schools at seven dollars per quarter and at $1.50 per quarter for pupils in the lower grades. The total amount received in tuition fees for the year ending June, 1862, was $24,133.10. The number of nonpaying students was 560.[3] Fees for the following two years remained the same with the exception that the lower-school pupils were charged at the rate of a dollar per quarter.[4] In July, 1863, after experimenting with the assessment of tuition fees in all schools, the board unanimously adopted a resolution that the schools would be free for the ensuing year with the exception of the high and the normal schools.[5] The principal of the normal school made objections to the plan of making the normal school a pay school and suggested that the board give serious attention to the matter of removing the tuition for the ensuing year.[6] While no definite date is listed for the abolishing of tuition fees for the upper schools, the last year for which tuition funds are listed in the annual receipts is the year ending August 1, 1867.[7] It seems safe to assume that tuition fees were abolished at that time, and no further efforts to collect tuition fees have been recorded.

State appropriations.--There is some evidence to support the contention that the early success of the St. Louis public schools contributed to some degree in establishing a system of education throughout the state of Missouri. Superintendent Divoll

---

[1] Seventh and Eighth Annual Reports, op. cit., pp. 29-30.

[2] Ibid., pp. 32-33. [3] Ibid., p. 56. [4] Ibid., p. 58.

[5] Ninth and Tenth Annual Reports, op. cit., p. 17.

[6] Ibid., p. 22.

[7] Thirteenth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 5.

reported that the popularity of the St. Louis schools had been influential to the extent that in 1854 the state legislature passed a law appropriating 25 per cent of the state revenue for the support of free schools. According to the provisions of this law, the fund was to be distributed to the different counties in proportion to the number of children between the ages of five and twenty-five. For the year 1854 the schools of St. Louis received an amount of $27,456.51 from this fund.[1]

At the beginning of the Civil War, all state aid was discontinued since Governor Jackson had confiscated all state school money.[2] This constituted a great blow to the cause of public education in the city since this fund had amounted to $29,159.76 for the school year ending in 1860.[3] By 1868 the state fund had again been apportioned to the various localities, St. Louis receiving in that year $36,706.45.[4]

By 1872 the city was paying more toward the support of schools throughout the state in apportioned taxes than it received from that source. During that year payments to that fund amounted to $150,000, whereas it secured in return less than half that amount. By 1930 the revenue from the state fund amounted to $494,385.99, or approximately 4 per cent of the total amount received in the general fund.[5] During the years of the depression, state aid to the St. Louis schools made up only 1 per cent of the amount accruing to the general fund in the St. Louis school district when the state's apportionment to St. Louis in 1934 was $170,260.92.[6]

In 1931 the legislature of the state of Missouri enacted a law commonly referred to as the 1931 School Law, or the Distribution Act of 1931.[7] The act guaranteed, if paid in full, to each district levying twenty cents on the one-hundred-dollar valuation,

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 109-10.

[2] Ninth and Tenth Annual Reports, op. cit., p. 7.

[3] Sixth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 60.

[4] Fourteenth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 101.

[5] Seventy-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 161.

[6] Eightieth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 144.

[7] Eighty-third Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 135-36.

a minimum of $750 for each elementary teacher and $1,000 for each high-school teacher. Districts such as St. Louis, which raise more than this amount of money would receive nothing from this arrangement. However, the law provided a $50 appropriation for each teacher receiving less than $1,000 and $100 for each teacher being paid more than $1,000. It is apparent that the act which was supposed to equalize educational opportunity favored the rural areas to the detriment of the larger areas, since rural areas by levying a twenty-cent tax could raise $200 per teacher and receive $550 from the state to guarantee an amount of $750. Districts which raise more than the amount of $200 would receive, as a result, nothing from the state fund excepting $50 for each teacher receiving less than $1,000 annually and $100 for each teacher paid more than $1,000.

The statute pertaining to the distribution of the state school fund was revised in 1943 to permit a better equalization of educational opportunity. The full effect of the law became evident during the year ending 1945 when the state's contribution to the St. Louis schools amounted to approximately 16 per cent of the total receipts.[1]

After a hundred years of operation, the general pattern for the support of schools had changed very little.[2] Schools were being supported largely by local taxes with additional aid from the state fund and funds appropriated by direct legislation, such as those for teacher training, vocational training, special schools, and textbooks. For the support of the public schools for the school year 1937-38, the city of St. Louis contributed 89 per cent, the state of Missouri 8.9 per cent, and miscellaneous sources 2.1 per cent.

Management of Fiscal Affairs

Table 3 shows the receipts and expenditures for the public schools for selected years throughout ninety years, 1850 to 1940. By 1940 the board was receiving and spending more than five hundred times the amount received and spent for the school year ending

---

[1] Ninety-first Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 133-34.

[2] Eighty-fourth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 159-64.

TABLE 3

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES FOR ST. LOUIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS FOR SELECTED YEARS FROM 1850 TO 1940[a]

Year	Total Receipts	Total Expenditures	Difference
1849-1850	$ 20,563.36	$ 20,563.36	....
1854-1855	87,239.24	87,239.24	....
1859-1860	162,733.36	162,733.36	....
1864-1865	207,065.91	269,827.24	$- 62,761.33
1869-1870[b]	637,405.72	663,768.20	- 26,362.48
1874-1875	1,179,513.24	815,413.89	364,099.35
1879-1880	942,443.69	835,200.99	107,242.70
1884-1885	1,021,135.49	970,495.78	50,639.71
1889-1890	1,244,417.55	1,181,547.29	62,870.26
1894-1895	1,724,869.48	1,582,708.75	142,160.73
1899-1900	1,929,732.55	1,971,882.77	- 43,150.22
1904-1905	3,208,591.00	2,854,661.10	257,929.90
1909-1910[c]	4,206,510.02	4,109,861.53	96,648.49
1914-1915	4,709,494.43	4,947,630.48	-238,136.05
1919-1920	6,424,252.27	6,473,074.57	- 48,822.30
1924-1925	11,176,646.24	11,077,953.43	98,692.81
1929-1930	13,028,589.80	13,335,342.40	-306,753.35
1934-1935	10,180,859.80	9,770,036.90	410,822.90
1939-1940	11,186,685.13	11,392,574.18	-205,889.05

[a]Sources: Twenty-first Annual Report, Seventy-first Annual Report, and Eighty-sixth Annual Report.

[b]For fiscal years 1849-50 to 1869-70 no exact basis for listing revenues are stated.

[c]For the fiscal years 1870-71 to 1911-12 inclusive, general, permanent, and other fund receipts are shown. Beginning with the fiscal year, 1912-13, and thereafter, only general revenue fund receipts are given.

1850. A study of the column labeled "Difference" indicates that for some years positive balances existed, while in others deficits accumulated. A constant struggle throughout the period was maintained to provide expanding educational opportunities for a growing school population. The per capita costs shown in the First Annual Report, issued for 1853-54, gives a per capita expenditure per elementary pupil of about $12.75 and per high-school pupil of approximately $30.00.[1] These had grown for the school year 1939-40 to $76.93 and $149.29, respectively.[2]

[1]First Annual Report, op. cit., p. 71.

[2]Eighty-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 322.

The great increase in expenditures following the Civil War are accounted for in part by the tremendous increase in the number of schoolhouses.[1] In 1865 twenty-one schoolhouses containing 8,976 seats were in existence. This number had increased to forty-eight schoolhouses with 20,105 seats by 1870. The system again doubled in the next decade.[2]

Early financial problems were handled very largely by the board of education itself through the secretary. That the officials were conscientious in these matters is evidenced by the fact that in 1879, when expenditures had reached a point where it seemed doubtful as to whether they could be met, a "retrenchment committee" studied the affairs of the board.[3] Also, as a check upon the fiscal affairs of the board, a resolution was passed on June 12, 1879, to appoint a committee of five, consisting of two members of the board and three citizens, to examine the books and accounts of the secretary, treasurer, and bailiff of the board.[4] Out of these investigations certain reforms were advocated to improve the financial administration of the board.

Among the reforms was the plan of awarding current deposits to the bank offering the highest rate of interest and with proper security instead of the former plan whereby the treasurer handled the funds in his own way on personal security only and without payment of any interest. Other changes brought about concerned recognition and observance of the different funds, an inauguration and strict observance of the annual appropriations to the several branches of expenditure, improved methods of auditing bills, and the establishment of improved business methods in all departments.

The board, in scrutinizing expenditures, studied the amount paid for janitors' salaries and decided they were somewhat excessive for the service received. High costs for this item were attributed in part to the fact that the board had a great number of small schools in operation. In order to improve the qualifications of the janitors, the board ruled that after a given date no

---

[1] Sixteenth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 12.

[2] Twenty-fifth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 31.

[3] Official Proceedings, op. cit., III (June 12, 1879), 213.

[4] Ibid., p. 260.

janitor should be employed who could not read and write the English language.[1]

In 1880 the examining committee recommended that the board employ an auditor, the position to be filled by the public at a popular election.[2] This would have made this officer independent of the board and the recommendation was not followed. By 1888 the matter came again before the board.[3] It was pointed out that, under the system existing at that time, the disbursements were being made almost wholly by the secretary, since the president, who signed the checks, could not be expected to be familiar with all the vouchers. The board appointed an auditor in 1890. He set about at once to modernize the system of keeping the board's accounts.[4]

The examining committee, reporting for 1891, found the fiscal affairs of the board in fairly good order. Certain irregularities, however, were pointed out. They suggested that the rule concerning the interest of board members in contracts concerning school expenditures should be carefully observed and intimated that it had not been fully adhered to in the past. They found fault with the records of the building department and suggested certain positive changes.[5] The following year the committee suggested a method of saving money through a policy of advertising for bids on all materials to be used for repairs, and also voiced the opinion that the board's force of employees in the building department could be utilized in making needed repairs.[6]

By 1893 several reforms had been made in the board's financial arrangements.[7] In its report for that year, the committee stated that,

> The system of bookkeeping in use in the offices of the Secretary and Treasurer, and the Auditor, and the method of

---

[1] Twenty-eighth Annual Report. op. cit., pp. 40-41.

[2] Official Proceedings, op. cit., III (February 17, 1880), 394.

[3] Thirty-fourth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 22.

[4] Thirty-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., p. xcvii.

[5] Thirty-seventh Annual Report, op. cit., pp. cxvii-cxx.

[6] Thirty-eighth Annual Report, op. cit., p. cxii.

[7] Thirty-ninth Annual Report, op. cit., p. cxlviii.

> supervision of matters--which are quite numerous and extensive--are excellent. Any desired information as to the status of a fund or an account, or a matter pending before the Board, can be supplied almost at a moment's notice, the record of such matters being kept in perfect shape for ready reference and ascertainment. The same may be said in regard to information required of the architect, in his department.[1]

During the period immediately following 1890, the board began to examine critically all expenditures in order to effect savings wherever possible. One of the items examined was the amount paid for fire insurance. It was found that the board had largely overpaid in the shape of premiums, any losses which had been sustained by fires. The board decided to create a special sinking fund to pay all damages which might occur through fires in the district schools instead of paying the insurance premiums according to the former policy.[2]

Another action concerned the matter of tuition pupils. Several cases arose whereby citizens in St. Louis sought admittance of certain pupils not entitled to school at the expense of the city. The board held that it could not admit non-resident children even though they were living with relatives or friends who were bona fide taxpayers. Children of indigent parents living with indigent relatives were not, however, to be denied the rights of an education.[3]

At the time these economies were being effected, the board began to experience further demands upon the part of the school patrons. Many buildings were overcrowded and additions needed. Other buildings were dilapidated and unsanitary. In providing accommodations, the board found it necessary to rent rooms and resort to double-time sessions. In addition, there was a strong demand for an extension of the free textbook system.[4]

The desire to refrain from extra taxation prompted the board to oppose the payment from the school funds of the costs of the special election of the school board held in 1897. The board held that the law intended that such elections should be paid for from city funds and was successful in its contention, thereby saving approximately $40,000,[5] in this election made necessary by

---

[1] Ibid. [2] Forty-first Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 16-17.

[3] Ibid., p. 53. [4] Forty-fourth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 13.

[5] Ibid., pp. 14-15.

the change in the charter.

In pursuing the effort to increase revenues, the board requested its attorney to confer with the collector and assessor and appear before the board of equalization in the interest of discovering properties which had been escaping taxation in the past. As a result of this activity, it was estimated that the revenues from these new sources would amount to from $15,000 to $25,000 annually. Additional income was realized by making careful appraisals in the case of new leases or renewals and in the renting of space in the new board of education building.

Other savings effected at this time concerned the management of school property.[1] A complete inventory was made of all school property. Inventory books were printed in triplicate with one copy to the secretary and treasurer, one copy to the school concerned, and the third copy remaining with the department of buildings. Surplus furniture was collected, necessary repairs made, and redistributed as the needs warranted. Purchases of new furniture were kept at a minimum.

One other activity studied by this board came in for some criticism. The supply department had for some time utilized the school principals in selling books and supplies to the pupils. The board recognized considerable laxity in some of these transactions. Some principals used these collections from sales as though the money were their own and that as long as they were "good for it," such action could not be justly criticized. This matter was corrected by the board to the point where it was well understood that any principal misconceiving his relation to the board in these matters was subjecting himself to immediate dismissal.[2]

For the first time in the history of the schools, the supply department for the year ending 1899 assumed the responsibility of purchasing all articles used in the schools and other departments. At one letting in May and June of 1899 arrangements were made for the purchase of a year's supply of needed materials. Although the experience was somewhat complicated, the plan was considered successful. The auditor co-operated by examining the regularity and propriety of all bills accumulated.[3]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 181.

[2] Ibid., p. 29.

[3] Forty-fifth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 29-30.

There is some evidence that the board refrained from using the position of membership on the board for personal gain. During the fiscal year ending in 1903, the board, according to regulations, awarded its cash deposits to a bank which, together with the security required, offered the best rate of interest. A member of the board, holding stock in that bank promptly resigned because of his interest in the bank.[1]

There was a tremendous increase in both receipts and expenditures as shown in Table 3 for the period from 1900-1910. An examination of the annual report for the year 1901-02 reveals that about one-fourth of the revenue for the year had been spent in the construction of new buildings.[2] Additional costs arose from small increases awarded the teachers.[3] A part of the increase in revenue the following year was also used to increase the salaries of teachers and principals.[4] Likewise, the plan of furnishing free schoolbooks to all students was extended to include the high school.

By 1915 the increase in the number of pupils had been so great that the problem of accommodating them was beyond the means of the board. In spite of the need of expanding, it was necessary to restrict the activities, which caused grave concern to those interested in the educational future of St. Louis.[5] Attempts were made in 1915 to effect certain curtailments. Summer terms were discontinued but, because of that experience, were restored in 1916. Certain classes were discontinued in the evening schools and public disapproval resulted. The curriculum was studied for its effectiveness. The situation became so urgent that a special election was considered necessary for the purpose of authorizing a bond issue for building purposes.[6] Conscientious in their efforts to maintain the confidence of the public, it was decided to have an expert survey the condition of the schools in regard

---

[1] Forty-ninth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 8-9.

[2] Forty-eighth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 27.

[3] Ibid., p. 50.

[4] Forty-ninth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 10-13.

[5] Sixty-second Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 19-21.

[6] Ibid., pp. 23-25.

to their needs. The survey revealed that "St. Louis is abundantly able to give more support than is now being given to education."[1] The issue was authorized on November 11, 1916.[2]

In spite of the fact that the need for additional revenue was less acute during the early twenties, the situation became bad. According to Table 3, the expenditures for the school year 1929-30 exceeded the receipts by well over three hundred thousand dollars.[3] This increased cost was attributed to a number of factors: (1) increased pupil enrollment; (2) increased school life of pupils in number of years; (3) establishment of evening schools for adults; (4) increased educational opportunity for handicapped children; (5) development of summer schools and other activities; (6) procurement of better equipment; (7) higher requirements for teachers with corresponding salary increases; and (8) higher pay for all employees as an outgrowth of higher living costs.[4]

The increase in costs was not accompanied by increased revenues. The receipts for 1929 and 1930 show a reduction from approximately thirteen million dollars to about ten million. This decrease came about for a number of reasons: (1) assessed value of real estate was lowered by the state board of equalization in the amount of 10 per cent and followed that by an additional 10 per cent reduction; (2) delinquency in tax payments; (3) lower appropriations from the state fund; and (4) less income from the merchants' and manufacturers' taxes.[5]

Increasing costs and diminishing revenues brought about a situation which called for lower expenditures. The action taken in 1934 to decrease the costs brought retrenchments to nineteen areas of expenditures: (1) reduction of 10 per cent in salaries; (2) postponement of building construction and repairs; (3) discontinuation of summer schools; (4) establishment of two-year courses for students not preparing to teach; (5) use of intermediate schools as senior high schools; (6) transfer of intermediate pupils to elementary schools; (7) establishment of ninth-grade centers in

---

[1] Ibid., p. 31.

[2] Sixty-third Annual Report, op. cit., p. 281.

[3] Sixty-eighth Annual Report, op. cit., p. xi.

[4] Seventy-sixth Annual Report, op. cit., p. 20.

[5] Eightieth Annual Report, op. cit., pp. 13-14.

elementary buildings; (8) lowered initial salaries; (9) added restrictions on issuance of carfare and use of telephones, and wider use of buildings; (10) elimination of playground activities during certain seasons; (11) reduction in length of term of evening schools; (12) placement of several supervisors in teaching positions; (13) some curtailment of vocational education; (14) lowered salaries for school nurses and physicians; (15) placement of retarded pupils in regular elementary schools; (16) elimination of regular teaching service from institutions outside the city; (17) abolishment of certain administrative and supervisory positions; (18) increased class size; and (19) added economy in use of supplies and materials.[1]

By 1937 yearly local revenues had begun to increase and state funds were augmented somewhat because of sales tax collections. The board found it possible to restore a part of the salary reductions effected during the depression. However, it became evident by 1939 that revenues had been somewhat permanently impaired under existing conditions. Real estate values had declined considerably. Old buildings had been wrecked on certain properties by their owners in order to reduce taxation. The movement to the suburban areas had taken some of the city's wealth, thereby causing an additional drying up of local tax receipts. Transportation costs and tuition fees required by out-state pupils had caused St. Louis' share of the state fund to reach an all-time low.[2]

One important advance was made in the matter of adoption and administration of the budget. The budget, prior to this time, had been prepared on a departmental basis. Because of this type of budget organization the appropriations or the expenditures from the appropriations did not present a consolidated view of the anticipated cost of the various activities or functions.[3] Under the plan now in use, all comparable data can be compiled on the basis of the following functions: administration, instruction, coordinate auxiliary, operation maintenance, fixed charges, and capital outlay.[4] This method of budgeting resulted in the elimi-

---

[1] Ibid., p. 18. [2] Eighty-third Annual Report, op. cit., p. 11.

[3] Eighty-fifth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, 1939, p. 107.

[4] Eighty-seventh Annual Report, op. cit., p. 12.

nation of many detailed accounts in the various subdivisions within the budget without sacrificing administrative control over the general functions as well as provided greater ease in allocating various expenditures from the functional accounts into the cost tables of the various schools. One further advantage attained is the fact that national agencies, such as the National Education Association, generally request data compiled on the functional basis and not on a departmental basis.

Educational Costs in St. Louis Compared with Other Cities

An account of the various items of expenditure in financing education in the city of St. Louis as compared to similar expenditures in other cities is some indication of the board's policy of financial administration. Of the ten representative mid-western cities selected, nine contained populations ranging from 100,000 to 999,999. Chicago, the largest city of the group, was selected because of its general proximity to St. Louis. The other cities selected are comparable to St. Louis in size and geographic location.

The data shown in Table 4 indicate expenditures in the following classifications: administration, instruction, operation of the physical plant, maintenance of the physical plant, auxiliary school services, fixed charges, and total for the year. Only those expenditures relating to full-time public day schools below the college level are listed. Payments for children in special institutions, for debt service, and for capital outlay are not included.

It will be noted from Table 4 that St. Louis ranks fourth in total yearly expenditures, with Chicago, Cincinnati, and Minneapolis reporting higher totals. St. Louis ranked first both in amount and per cent of expenditures for administration, maintenance, and operation of the physical plant. Only one city (Chicago) reported a lower per cent of total expenditures for instruction. It is interesting to note that St. Louis had no expenses for fixed charges. This is due to the fact that the statutes at that time made no provisions for the contributions by the board to any retirement fund. However, during the school year ending in 1945, the board reported that 5 per cent of all expenditures had been allotted to the fixed charge account as the board's contribution to the retirement system recently instituted.[1]

---

[1] Ninety-first Annual Report, op. cit., p. 134.

TABLE 4

EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL FOR SIX MAJOR CURRENT EXPENSE ACCOUNTS DURING THE YEAR 1943-44 IN TEN SELECTED CITIES[a]

City	Administration		Instruction		Operation of Physical Plant		Maintenance of Physical Plant		Auxiliary School Services		Fixed Charges		Total Yearly Expenditures
	Expenditure	Per Cent of Total	Expenditure	Per Cent of Total	Expenditure	Per Cent of Total	Expenditure	Per Cent of Total	Expenditure	Per Cent of Total	Expenditure	Per Cent of Total	
Atlanta....	$2.37	2.5	$ 78.27	84.6	$ 6.86	7.4	$3.66	4.0	$0.72	0.8	$0.68	0.7	$ 92.56
Rank.....	(8)	(8)	(7)	(1)	(10)	(10)	(5)	(4)	(8)	(8)	(9)	(9)	(8)
Chicago....	4.82	2.9	116.99	70.4	24.54	14.8	8.92	5.4	2.30	1.4	8.59	5.1	166.16
Rank.....	(3)	(5)	(2)	(10)	(1)	(1)	(2)	(2)	(3)	(5)	(1)	(4)	(1)
Cincinnati.	5.69	3.5	123.42	76.5	19.38	12.0	4.88	3.0	2.24	1.4	5.79	3.6	161.40
Rank.....	(2)	(3)	(1)	(5)	(2)	(6)	(4)	(7)	(5)	(5)	(5)	(6)	(2)
Denver.....	3.75	3.0	101.41	79.9	9.93	7.8	3.05	2.4	2.28	1.8	6.50	5.0	126.92
Rank.....	(5)	(4)	(4)	(3)	(8)	(9)	(7)	(10)	(4)	(4)	(3)	(5)	(5)
Kansas City	3.40	2.8	94.18	76.6	15.28	12.4	5.57	4.5	0.59	0.5	3.87	3.2	122.89
Rank.....	(6)	(6)	(5)	(4)	(5)	(5)	(3)	(3)	(10)	(10)	(7)	(7)	(6)
Minneapolis	3.18	2.3	102.49	73.5	18.06	13.0	3.66	2.6	3.82	2.7	8.28	5.9	139.49
Rank.....	(7)	(9)	(3)	(7)	(3)	(3)	(5)	(8)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(3)	(3)
Nashville..	1.57	2.1	58.02	76.2	7.46	9.8	2.55	3.3	1.86	2.5	4.65	6.1	76.11
Rank.....	(10)	(10)	(10)	(6)	(9)	(8)	(10)	(5)	(6)	(3)	(6)	(2)	(10)
Okla. City.	2.34	2.7	70.45	80.9	10.15	11.6	2.65	3.1	0.71	0.8	0.81	0.9	87.11
Rank.....	(9)	(7)	(9)	(7)	(7)	(7)	(8)	(6)	(9)	(8)	(8)	(8)	(9)
Omaha.....	4.09	4.0	74.50	72.7	13.64	13.3	2.59	2.5	1.41	1.4	6.27	6.1	102.50
Rank.....	(4)	(2)	(8)	(8)	(6)	(2)	(9)	(9)	(7)	(5)	(4)	(1)	(7)
St. Louis..	6.01	4.7	93.14	72.2	16.47	12.8	9.48	7.3	3.95	3.0	....	....	129.05
Rank.....	(1)	(1)	(6)	(9)	(4)	(4)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	....	....	(4)

[a] "Per Pupil Expenditures in City Schools," Education for Victory, III (June 4, 1945), 20-21.

Recent Developments

The report of the secretary and treasurer for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, shows that the revenue receipts were the largest in the history of the board. This was due, in part to the fact that there were no changes of any importance taking place in the over-all valuation, and also to the fact that current collections reached an exceedingly high level for the year. The main source of collection from the state comes from the state school fund according to a formula prescribed by the statutes. The effect of the revised law enacted in 1943, pertaining to the state fund, was a more equitable distribution since there was less discrimination against urban areas to favor rural districts. The effects of the act became noticeable in the allotment for the year ending in 1945.

Expenditures, also, increased during 1945. The board began contributing to the retirement fund and experienced higher costs for supplies and materials used in the general operation of the schools and capital outlay for plant and improvement of equipment. The secretary and treasurer reported that the board operated on a balanced budget, and that the operation of the budget had been in accordance with financial accounting as suggested by the United States Office of Education.[1]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 134-35.

CHAPTER IX

CONCLUSIONS

This is a study of the organization and administration of the public schools of St. Louis, Missouri, as they have evolved through the efforts of the state and of the locality to provide an adequate system for a rapidly growing community. It is believed that the problems which St. Louis has experienced in developing a public school system are somewhat typical of those which have arisen in other metropolitan communities having had comparable growth and expansion. It is further believed that in the solution of some of these problems, definite contributions have been made to the field of school organization and administration in urban communities. Likewise, through failure to solve some of the problems, implications may be drawn which offer valuable suggestions to those interested in educational administration.

While it is difficult to evaluate in a scientific manner the extent to which the development of school administration in St. Louis has influenced other public school systems throughout the United States, the following aspects of school administration in St. Louis are considered significant: (1) the relation of school organization to the legislative policy of the state; (2) the relation of the schools to the municipality; (3) the internal pattern of school-board organization; (4) the development of various types of schools; (5) the development of the school plant; and, (6) the leadership provided by the professional staff.

The Relation of School Organization to the Legislative Policy of the State

As in all states, legislative enactments have had a vital role in establishing, administering, financing, and extending the public schools of the city of St. Louis. The first acts of the territorial legislature were concerned largely with the management of property. The legislature found it necessary to enact further legislation concerning school lands as a result of a situation in which certain members of the board through selling and leasing of

lands sought personal gain. The state was, therefore, responsible to a large degree in preserving a permanent fund for the benefit of the schools.

With respect to the management of the schools, the state as early as 1833 established a corporation known as "The Board of President and Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools." The statutes specifically outlined the duties of the various officers to which the management of the schools was entrusted. When the schools expanded to an extent where the organization established by the act of 1833 became ineffective, the legislature granted a new charter in 1897. The act of 1897 created a "Board of Education of the City of St. Louis" and like the act of 1833 was specific with respect to its provisions concerning the duties of the officials designated to manage the schools. Some provision was made in each case, however, for the board to utilize additional officials for managing the schools as the needs warranted. In the light of the best current educational thought, there is some doubt as to whether the organization established both by the act of 1833 and the act of 1897 provided the best possible organization for the most efficient management of the schools. This matter will be discussed at a later point in this chapter.

When it became apparent that the income from the land grants was insufficient for the operation of the schools, the state authorized the levying of a tax on all real and personal property, provided the qualified voters within the city approved the levy. The first tax was levied and collected in 1850. Various increases were authorized, from time to time, until the maximum rate reached eighty-nine cents. These increases were secured in most instances only after considerable effort by the boards had been expended to secure them. The schools suffered as a result at various times because the increases authorized were insufficient to provide the necessary income. It was not until after 1920 that a given tax rate could be levied for more than a one-year period. Permission for the exercise of more local option in the matter of taxation would have greatly facilitated the board in its effort to secure greater revenue.

The state also enacted legislation which provided for a distribution of general state monies for the support of schools. Failure of the state to continue this appropriation during the Civil War resulted in the establishment of tuition fees for pupils.

However, since that time the state has apportioned annually a share of the state revenue to the various localities according to prescribed formulas. Until very recently, the distribution of state funds has been made according to a formula which favored the rural districts to the detriment of large cities such as St. Louis. A more equitable plan for distribution is now in operation as a result of legislation enacted in 1943.

Although the first legislation by the state in the matter of education pertained to furnishing the rudiments of nonsectarian education for white children only, later legislation guaranteed a free public education to all regardless of color. Provision was also made for establishing high schools and normal schools. In addition, grants were made to encourage vocational training and the education of handicapped children. The right of all children to a free education was strengthened in 1905 by the passage of compulsory education laws.

The city for a long time was handicapped because of the failure of the state to provide legislation enabling the school district to provide for the retirement of its elderly teachers. However, in 1943 the school district was authorized to contribute to a teacher-retirement fund, and tenure laws were enacted. Earlier enactment of these laws could have brought great benefit to the cause of education in the city of St. Louis.

The Relation of the Schools to the Municipality

From the beginning, the government of the schools in the city has been kept separate and apart from the government of other municipal affairs. This practice is in harmony with the ideas of current leaders in the field of school administration. While members of the board for a long period of time were elected from the various wards of the city and the number of members depended upon the number of wards, early legislation was specific in separating the governing body of the schools and the governing body of the city. Officials of the city government were prohibited from holding membership on the board of directors.

The available records show that there has been little interference by the city in any of the affairs of the schools. The difficulties which have been encountered arose largely from the failure of the boards to be guided by regulations of the city

concerning matters of health and safety. The differences which arose were settled by compromise and co-operation rather than by the enactment of legislation to solve the problems.

While the earlier statutes provided for complete separation of the boards of directors and the officials of the city government, the charter of 1897, which has formed the basis for the operation of the schools since that time, did provide for some minor supervision by the city. Through that legislation, the mayor was designated to appoint certain individuals to make an annual audit of the financial accounts of the board of education and to make reports concerning the same. The statutes further stipulated that the circuit court of the city could be appealed to upon proper petition of any officer of the board of education or of a specified number of citizens and householders. However, the charter of 1897 maintained the principle of definite separation of the board of education and the governing body of the city.

The board of education and the city officials have united their efforts in some instances in solving educational problems. There has been co-operative effort in providing for the city's unfortunate children. The city has provided housing and food and the board has provided instruction in the institutions maintained by the city for wayward children. The experiment of dual authority between the board of education and the board of managers appointed by the mayor of the city in caring for unfortunate children has been regarded as a success.

The Internal Pattern of School Board Organization

It is significant that none of the boards for the government of the St. Louis public schools has ever had a chief executive officer. Little is known concerning the board of trustees, the first corporation in St. Louis for public school purposes. The board of directors, established by the act of 1833, replaced the board of trustees. The charter of 1833 provided the following officials to govern the schools: (1) president, (2) secretary, and (3) treasurer. In addition to the officers provided specifically by law, the board had the following additional officials: (1) attorney, (2) superintendent, (3) bailiff, (4) architect, (5) supply agent, and (6) auditor. The supply agent was not added to the board until 1878, the office being created because of the

tremendous problems arising in connection with the handling of supplies. The office of auditor was established in 1890 to modernize the board's system of accounts, and came about as a result of considerable agitation and dissatisfaction by an examining committee with the board's handling of accounts. The examining committee was a group composed of board members and citizens of the city and had for its purpose the scrutinizing of the board's transactions. The board as organized according to the act of 1833 functioned until it was superseded by the organization designated in the charter of 1897.

The charter, as embodied in the legislation of 1897, placed the responsibility for the supervision, government, and administration of the schools in a board of twelve members and in a superintendent of instruction, a commissioner of school buildings, a secretary-treasurer, and an auditor.

The superintendent, subject to control of the board, was given supervision of the course of instruction, discipline, and conduct of the schools. He was authorized to initiate all appointments, promotions, and transfers of teachers. The only power vested in the board with respect to the appointment of teachers was that of approval or rejection. The building commissioner was charged with the responsibility for the care of all public-school buildings of the city and preparation of specifications for new buildings. The secretary-treasurer and the auditor were made the fiscal representatives of the board, the former as a custodian of funds and property and the latter as accountant.

In addition to the four heads of the departments called for by the statutes, the board exercised its own prerogative by establishing the offices of supply commissioner and attorney. The supply commissioner replaced the supply agent, an office which had been created in 1877. While these officers derived no authority from the charter, the board established rules to govern their actions. One other office created, but of short duration, was the office of comptroller.

The reduction of the number of board members to twelve by the charter of 1897 was an outgrowth of the difficulties which arose when the board had a larger membership. At one period in the board's history, the membership had increased to twenty-eight members. The smaller board was considered desirable because of the larger board's unwieldy character and because of its similitude

to a legislative body. The large membership of the board resulted from a system of ward representation and was considered one of the worst evils of the former charter. The charter of 1897 sought also to secure more efficient board operation by requiring that each member take an oath to the effect that he would not be influenced by any consideration except that of merit and fitness in the appointment of officers and engagement of employees.

By general consent, membership on the board was divided equally between the two major political parties. Under the present arrangement board members are not chosen with respect to their political affiliations.

The act of 1833 did not contain provisions requiring the establishment of committees, but the rules of the board created eleven standing committees to assist in the management of the board's affairs. A large share of the work of the board was done in the committees. It became the practice to create large committees with the membership representing all sections of the city. Smaller committees were considered undesirable because it was felt that smaller committees were too responsive to partisan pressure.

Since the organization of the board in 1897, four standing committees have been appointed annually as follows: committee on instruction, committee on school buildings, committee on finance, and committee on auditing and supplies. The administrative and executive duties formerly reserved for the committees of the board under the old organization were placed with the heads of the departments. By rules of the board, the committees were given supervisory but not executive and administrative power. The board retained its power to direct, control, and to supervise as a final source of authority. Each committee was given supervisory power over the department which it represents. Much of the board's business, therefore, is taken care of in the committee meetings prior to the regular meeting of the board.

Recently another committee has come into existence. A committee of executive officers consisting of the attorney, auditor, commissioner of school buildings, secretary-treasurer, supply commissioner, and superintendent of instruction as chairman, has been established. While none of the board reports definitely states the fact, it is possible to assume that the creation of this committee represents an effort to substitute this committee for the co-ordinating functions usually performed by a superintendent of

schools. This committee has acted in several instances when some matter arising before the board has had significance for more than one of the four departments of the board's multiple system. In the board's chart of organization, as shown in the organization chart of October, 1945, the committee of executive officers has been placed in an advisory position to the board of education.

For several years, the charter of 1897 proved to be a model fundamental law for the school system in St. Louis. It was recognized by some, however, that there were inherent weaknesses in the charter since the responsibility for the administration of the schools was distributed among so many different departments. Four officers were responsible to the board in the management of school affairs. This division of responsibility among the four officers made it possible for the board of education to assume for itself some of the executive functions, if it chose to do so.

During the year 1913, certain members of the board began to show a "management" type of interest in the internal affairs of the schools. However, it was not until several years later that the board interfered seriously with the smooth operation of the schools. During 1919 a controversy arose between one of the high-school principals and the superintendent of instruction. The principal took a defiant attitude and was upheld in his actions by the board of education. One other instance furnishes some information concerning the motives of the board during 1926. A director of reference, research, and publicity was appointed. In studying the reports of this official, it is evident that he was assigned by the board to evaluate many of the proposals of the superintendent then in office. When the superintendent of instruction was dismissed from the position of superintendent, the office of director, reference, research, and publicity was abolished. The board of education in 1942 subjected itself to considerable unfavorable publicity in attempting to dismiss the superintendent of instruction. The sentiment of the community as expressed in the editorials of the city's newspapers seemed to indicate that the board was in need of change.

The committee system which has been practiced by the boards of education in St. Louis from 1833 to the present time is not regarded favorably in the light of the best current educational thought. While it may be desirable to have special committees appointed from time to time to investigate and report as the needs

warrant, to permit a great amount of the regular business of the board to be handled by standing committees is a questionable practice. The committee system involves much detail and is time consuming, and since the board members in St. Louis receive no compensation for service as members of the board, it would seem to be somewhat of an imposition to demand from them sufficient time to consider carefully the various aspects of the board's business which is at the present time complicated and extensive. It would appear to be a far better practice to have this work performed by paid officials, professionally trained for the specific duties to be done. Under such a plan, the work would be accomplished by those in the service of the board, and any decisions reached would then be reviewed by the board as a whole.

Perhaps the greatest weakness in the board of education is the lack of a single executive officer responsible for the administration of the schools. St. Louis has never had a superintendent of schools since only the matters of instruction have been the function of a superintendent of instruction, and the matters of finance, supply, and buildings have been delegated to others co-equal to the superintendent of instruction. To effect the change needed to establish a single head for the system instead of the multiple organization at present, it would be necessary to change existing statutes. While the system which exists at present has worked smoothly during certain periods, a better guarantee of efficient administration could be secured with the establishment of the office of superintendent of schools. Such an official would be charged with all matters of school administration and the responsibility in those matters centered in a single functionary.

The Development of Various Types of Schools

The first public schools established in St. Louis were ungraded district schools. They were organized according to the monitorial plan of instruction. Under such an arrangement, a "trained" principal could oversee the large group of pupils while his assistants directed the classes in the adjoining rooms. By 1860 the graded plan of instruction had supplanted the monitorial school. This graded school, however, was not an eight-grade elementary organization at first. The eight-grade organization was established as a basic pattern at the convention of superintendents held in 1872.

The high school was established in 1853 as a part of one of the district schools. It is interesting to note that from the beginning the high school was coeducational, while the grammar departments of the district schools were organized to accommodate each of the sexes separately. By 1873 the principle of coeducation was well established in the St. Louis public schools.

It is significant that the public school administration became interested in the problem of differences in the needs of children very early in the history of the schools. By 1867 this matter was being discussed very freely by the superintendent of instruction. The study of German had been introduced as a result of the great number of German people who desired instruction in that language. This development was considered important enough to warrant the services of an assistant superintendent to direct German instruction in the schools.

Superintendent William T. Harris who occupied the position of superintendent of instruction from 1867 to 1880 felt that the chief weakness of the graded school was that all students were compared with the same standard. Because of the differences in capacity, temperaments, and mental endowments of pupils, some plan was needed to recognize these basic differences. In 1869 an intermediate school was established in response to this need. Over-age pupils in the grammar grades who did their best but failed to make normal progress through the school studies could enter this intermediate school to take a slow course in the higher branches. While the experiment at first was considered a success, it was discontinued within two years because it failed to accomplish the purposes for which it was intended. Teachers and pupils in the intermediate school were described as being discouraged as a result of a "contagious atmosphere" which appeared to dampen the ardor of the pupils.

A junior high school was organized in St. Louis in 1917 and continued its operation until 1924, when the board of education renamed the junior high school, without changing its basic organization, as an intermediate school. Other intermediate schools were organized but were not of the type which had been established during the superintendency of William T. Harris. These schools never actually accomplished the purposes for which they were established. This was due in part to the fact that the buildings which housed them were not adapted to the purposes of a school

for adolescent pupils. During the retrenchment program occasioned by the depression, the intermediate schools were changed into regular high schools.

With the increased enrollment incident to the depression it became necessary to expand the facilities of the high schools. To accommodate the high-school enrollment the ninth grade was established in many of the elementary schools. These ninth-grade centers were actually small one-grade high schools operating within the elementary schools. While some attention was given to pupils unable to make normal progress through the grades in these centers, the fact that they were abolished when accommodations were available in the high schools is an indication that this division was not intended to form a basic division in the school system of the city.

One of the chief contributions of the St. Louis public schools to the system of education in the United States was the development of the kindergarten. As early as 1871, the superintendent of instruction felt that classes should be started for the very young children in order to preserve them from the corrupting influences of the street. In 1873 a kindergarten was established in the Des Peres School. Miss Susan Blow offered to conduct the experiment gratis if the board would furnish the rooms and one teacher for the purpose of learning the methods. Her offer was accepted and the experiment was conducted with great success.

By 1885 the kindergarten had been established as a fundamental part of the system of education in St. Louis. Kindergarten training under competent and well-trained teachers was expected to accomplish the following results: (1) establish a good physical development; (2) bring about quickness of invention and fertility of imagination; (3) develop a keen sense of symmetry and harmony; (4) form great mechanical skill in the use of the hands; (5) establish ability to form rapid judgments in number, measure, and size at a glance of the eye; and (6) develop initiative into the conventionalities of polite society in their demeanor towards their fellows, and in the matters of eating, drinking, and personal cleanliness.

The teachings of Froebel were studied for all their implications for the kindergarten organization. Many of his ideas were embodied in the "gifts" and "occupations." The materials and

methods as used in the development of the kindergarten in St. Louis became an established part of the kindergarten as it spread to other sections of the country. Likewise, the use of small tables and chairs in the kindergarten in St. Louis became standard equipment for other kindergartens.

While St. Louis played an important part in sponsoring the kindergarten movement, it is interesting to note that the nursery school has not been established in St. Louis as a fundamental part of the public school system. This may be due in part to the fact that the city of St. Louis has not been willing to assume the expenses involved, and to the fact that the early methods of the kindergarten became so firmly established that newer practices have been difficult to implant.

One other extension of the St. Louis public school system that attained considerable significance was the Normal School. The need for professionally trained teachers was reported as early as 1854. The addition of a normal school was urged to satisfy this need. The Normal School went into operation during the year 1857 for the specific purpose of instructing prospective teachers "under the eye of a Normal Professor," in the branches required to be taught in the primary grades.

In addition to instructing prospective teachers, the Normal School served as an in-service training institution for teachers already serving on the instructional staff in the St. Louis schools. Saturday classes were organized, and a model school developed where teaching could be observed or practiced by normal students. The Normal School which became the Harris Teachers College in 1910 assumed three distinct functions: (1) the training of new teachers for the city's public schools; (2) the further general and professional training of those in the employ of the schools; and (3) the scientific study of problems of city school teaching, supervision, and administration.

In discussing the types of schools established in St. Louis, some mention is necessary concerning the provisions made for the colored race. Education of the Negro prior to the Civil War was prohibited by the statutes. By 1867, however, the board had established three elementary schools for colored pupils. High-school instruction was provided in 1875, and normal instruction in 1899.

While the principle of segregation for instructing colored and white students was established by law, the board has been

conscientious in attempting to approximate educational opportunities for whites in its provision for members of the colored race. Special school for the handicapped, evening schools, and a vocational school have been established for the education of the Negro. It is significant that the salary schedule in operation for white teachers is the same as that used for colored teachers.

In spite of the early efforts in St. Louis to establish schools in response to the needs of the pupils and the community, the system of schools is at present based upon the kindergarten and eight-grade plan for the elementary grades, and the four-year high school. This is not the best type of organization in the opinion of leading administrators, and is not the plan of organization used by many large school systems of the country. The adoption of a 6-4-4 plan of educational organization would be a forward step for the St. Louis public schools.

The Development of the School Plant

The first school buildings in St. Louis were elementary schools designed for the monitorial type of instruction. The buildings in use at that time were similar to those being used in other cities having that type of instruction. As early as 1857, however, these early buildings were criticized by the superintendent of instruction. He set about to correct the situation by formulating a definite policy for school construction. In establishing generalizations for consideration in a satisfactory program of construction, the leading school systems of the country were visited to secure details of constructing schoolhouses which would meet the needs of the city of St. Louis. Some of the recommendations made for the policy of school construction were: (1) schoolhouses should be built or reconstructed for the graded system; (2) schools should be of uniform size and so constructed that later additions could be made; (3) each building should be adapted to contain only one organization; (4) the policy of renting buildings should be abandoned; and (5) schools should be built to accommodate an enrollment of about seven hundred pupils.

The board very early saw the wisdom of employing an architect to assist in planning the construction of school buildings. The function of the architect later became the responsibility of the building commissioner. Since the building commissioner was

responsible to the board of education and not to the superintendent of instruction, he wielded great power in the educational program. One of these building commissioners was William B. Ittner whose contributions to the field of school construction are well known as evidenced by the wide circulation given to his building plans.

The development of the portable schoolroom was a noteworthy contribution of the school system of St. Louis. By 1900 there were twenty-five portable schoolrooms in operation. The portable building was of uniform size and so constructed that sections were built upon frames and could be bolted together readily in such a manner as to make a very tight room. Heating and ventilation were accomplished by means of an indirect furnace with double casing. By actual test it was found that each pupil was being provided with the correct amount of fresh air. Other large cities manifested great interest in the portable as developed in St. Louis.

The buildings provided for the eight-grade elementary school have been substantially built and have possessed architectural design of an attractive type. Kindergarten rooms have been well planned and present a desirable atmosphere. Likewise, the buildings erected to serve the cosmopolitan type of high school have served their purposes in a commendable way. Some of the buildings constructed for the instruction of handicapped children show excellent adaptations for that type of pupil.

There is some evidence, however, that in recent years, the independence of the building commissioner has resulted in a situation where the instructional needs of the schools with respect to the community situation were overlooked. There are at present some indications that the recent survey which pointed out certain inadequacies in the program of school construction is being used in developing a policy which will be responsive both to the needs of the schools and the needs of the community.

The Leadership Provided by the Professional Staff

A study of the reports and other literature concerning the schools of St. Louis reveals that the public school system of that city was fortunate in having had men of good professional judgment and wisdom in developing an educational policy for the early schools. It is probable that the first influential superintendent of instruction in St. Louis was John Tice who made his first report

in 1854. A study of his and other reports made during the early period reveals that there was little necessity for the board's assuming much responsibility for the teaching performed in the schools. Many of these early reports contain discussions which give evidence of sound educational philosophies on the part of the early superintendents. Tice discussed the various subjects of the curriculum and took an active part in the supervision of the schools. He was interested in having the schools adopt whatever practices science, investigation, and experiment revealed as worth while.

Superintendent Tice's successor was Ira Divoll who continued the enlightened practices of his predecessor. Among Divoll's contributions to the educational system in St. Louis was his great interest in adapting the schools to a graded system. He set about to develop a policy of efficient school-construction. In developing that policy he employed the very desirable technique of visiting other schools of the country to secure the details of constructing buildings which would meet the needs of the community.

Divoll felt that it was the duty of the superintendent of instruction to acquaint himself with the conditions which existed in the schools. He used the hours of the school day for visiting classrooms for the purpose of examining all departments and classes in the branches allotted to each, for observing the methods of discipline and instruction pursued by the teacher, and rendered such assistance and advice as he considered apropos.

While it was the work of Tice and Divoll to firmly establish the position of superintendent, it remained for William T. Harris to expand the superintendent's influence. He set about to educate the boards in the various aspects of school administration. In addition to the positive interest he maintained in the academic side of the schools, he took an active part in the business and financial affairs of the schools. Salary schedules were developed which paid moderate wages to new and inexperienced teachers and greater sums to those with greater experience and to those in more responsible positions.

Harris also championed the principle of coeducation, the scientific study of education, a promotional plan which recognized the individual differences among children, the development of a well-planned organized course of study, and was influential in establishing the school principalship as a major position in the

school system. His contributions to the kindergarten movement are well known. After the public kindergarten had been successfully established in St. Louis during his leadership, the other cities throughout the country were not slow to take it up. A study of his record reveals that he was not only an outstanding leader in St. Louis but also became an educational leader of national influence. As superintendent of instruction, he was interested in bringing to St. Louis the best that was thought and known for the benefit of the school system.

Also of particular significance was the influence of Superintendents F. Louis Soldan and Ben Blewett. Soldan wrote extensively of the work of the classroom and its relation to the life of the community. He described in detail the role of the superintendent, the principal and the teacher. He developed the policy that the "welfare of the child shall be the highest law." During his leadership he made it clear that the schools were not to be considered as existing for the benefit of the teacher or any other school official. He urged the establishment of a system of discipline, such as would be exercised by a "kind and judicious parent in the family."

Superintendents Blewett and Withers recognized the necessity of providing a system to care for handicapped children, and it was under their leadership also that the junior high school was established in St. Louis. Blewett concerned himself with the matter of urging a system of retirement which would care for old and needy teachers. He felt that one of the chief needs of St. Louis was some method of providing security for the teaching staff. Because of his deep concern for this matter, he established a foundation in trust to a board of trustees known as "The Board of Trustees of the St. Louis Public Schools Foundation for the Relief of Distress and for the Advancement of Professional Training," and subscribed fifty thousand dollars as a memorial to his wife and her parents to be known as "The Jessie Parsons Blewett Fund."

It was fortunate for the St. Louis public schools that during their formative years they had the wise guidance manifested by Harris, Soldan, and Blewett, and enough has been said to show the dynamic leadership which they furnished the schools. Many other educators from St. Louis have attained national prominence in the field of education. Their influence was hampered in some respects by the interference of politically-minded boards of edu-

cation.

In studying the annual reports of the various superintendents and the volumes containing the printed records of board proceedings, it appears that during the time of such effective superintendents as Divoll, Harris, Soldan, and Blewett, the boards were both harmonious and efficient. During other times the schools have frequently suffered from a lack of harmonious organization. It is perhaps more than mere coincidence that the most influential superintendents have been in office during the periods when the boards have functioned to the best advantage. Whether the quality of members of the board is a result of influential leadership on the part of the superintendent, or whether the superintendent has been effective because of an efficient board is a matter of conjecture. However, there appears to be sufficient evidence to state that there has been a definite relationship between these situations as described.

Concluding Statement

In conclusion it may be stated that the problems of school administration which appeared in St. Louis were due largely to an expanding school population, an extension of educational opportunities, lack of an established pattern for solving educational problems, and a changing philosophy of the scope and purpose of education. In the solution of these problems, the system of public schools achieved national recognition of success in some instances, and in others fell short of the standards established by leading educational opinion. The schools during their formative period attained outstanding success with respect to the needs of the community. That success has not been so characteristic of later efforts in St. Louis. The future success of school administration in the city depends very largely upon the success of the city in obtaining statutes which will permit administrative reorganization to conform to the best educational practices, and upon how well the local community attacks the problem of selecting civic-minded individuals to the board of education. There is some indication on the part of the city and the present administration of the schools of a desire to effect an organization which will re-establish the leadership of the city in education such as that achieved in its illustrious past.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Cubberley, Elwood P. Public School Administration. New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1916. Pp. viii + 480.

Dexter, Edwin Grant. A History of Education in the United States. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1904. Pp. xx + 656.

Edwards, Newton. The Courts and the Public Schools. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1933. Pp. xvi + 592.

Judd, Charles H. Survey of the St. Louis Public Schools. Part I, Organization and Administration. Pp. viii + 276; Part II, The Work of the Schools. Pp. vi + 360; Part III, Finances. Pp. vi + 246. New York: World Book Co., 1918.

Scharf, J. Thomas. History of Saint Louis City and County. Vol. I. St. Louis: Louis H. Everts & Co., 1883. Pp. xii + 982.

Shepard, Elihu H. The Early History of St. Louis and Missouri. St. Louis: Southwestern Book & Publishing Co., 1870. Pp. viii + 170.

Strayer, George D. A Report of a Survey of the Public Schools of St. Louis, Missouri. New York: Bureau of Publications, Columbia University, 1939. Pp. xxiv + 468.

Taylor, J. N., and Crooks, M. O. Sketch Book of Saint Louis. St. Louis: George Knapp & Co., 1858. Pp. i + 430.

Reports

Annual Reports of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, 1854-1945.

Official Proceedings, Board of Education, St. Louis, Vols. I-LI (1872-1945).

Articles

Eliot, Edward C. "School Administration: The St. Louis Method," Educational Review, XXVI (December, 1903), 464-75.

"Facilities for Negro Education in St. Louis," Public School Messenger, XXXV (January 3, 1938), 92-93.

"History of Harris Teachers College," Public School Messenger, XXX (September 1, 1932), 13-15.

"History of Stowe Teachers College," Public School Messenger, XXX (September 1, 1932), 15-17.

"Music in the St. Louis Schools," Public School Messenger, XXXV (January 3, 1938), 94.

"Per Pupil Expenditures in City Schools," Education for Victory,

III (June 4, 1945), 20-21.

"Regulations of the Department of Instruction, St. Louis Public Schools," Public School Messenger, XXXI (February 1, 1934), 61-62.

Tice, John H. "Central High School," Teacher and Western Educational Magazine, I (August, September, and October, 1853), 289-95.

Tice, John H. "School Supervision," Teacher and Western Educational Magazine, I (April, 1853), 136-41.

Miscellaneous

Lawson, Douglas E. Curriculum Development in City School Systems. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Education, University of Chicago. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1940.

Rules and Regulations of the Board of Education of the City of St. Louis. St. Louis: Board of Education, 1926.

St. Louis Post-Dispatch, January 16, 1940.

St. Louis Star Times, June 24, 1942.

"St. Louis Public Evening Schools Adult Education Program, 1945-1946." (Pamphlet.)

Legal Documents

Public Statutes at Large of the United States of America, 1800-1813, Vol. II.

Laws of Missouri, 1804-1824, Vol. I.

Laws of Missouri, 1824-1836, Vol. II.

Laws of Missouri, 1825, Vol. I.

Private and Local Acts of the State of Missouri, 1835.

Revised Statutes, State of Missouri, 1834-1835.

Local Laws and Private Acts of the State of Missouri, 1845.

Laws of Missouri, 1849.

Laws of Missouri, 1852-1853.

Laws of Missouri, 1857.

Laws of Missouri, 1863-64.

Laws of Missouri, 1865-1866.

Revised Statutes, State of Missouri, 1866.

Laws of Missouri, 1870.

Laws of Missouri, 1875.

Revised Statutes, State of Missouri, 1879, Vol. I.

Laws of Missouri, 1879.

Laws of Missouri, 1895.

Laws of Missouri, 1897.

Laws of Missouri, 1901.

Laws of Missouri, 1905.

Laws of Missouri, 1909.

Laws of Missouri, 1913.

Laws of Missouri, 1917.

Laws of Missouri, 1919.

Laws of Missouri, 1921.

State of Missouri School Laws of Sixty-second General Assembly, 1943.

Proposed New Constitution Adopted by the 1943-1944 Constitutional Convention of Missouri.